

School Improvement Grants Application

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Fiscal Year 2010

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name:Michigan



U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202



OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: September 30, 2013

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0682. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

School Improvement Grants (SIG), authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) that SEAs use to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of students in their lowest-performing schools. Under the final requirements published in the *Federal Register* on October 28, 2010 (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>), school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of a State's Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible (and participating) elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier I schools ("newly eligible" Tier I schools). Tier II schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of a State's secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds, secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) secondary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier II schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years ("newly eligible" Tier II schools). An LEA also may use school improvement funds in Tier III schools, which are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as Tier I or Tier II schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) schools ("newly eligible" Tier III schools). (See Appendix B for a chart summarizing the schools included in each tier.) In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

Availability of Funds

The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2010, provided \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2010. In addition, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) estimates that, collectively, States have carried over approximately \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG funds that will be combined with FY 2010 SIG funds, for a total of nearly \$1.4 billion that will be awarded by States as part of their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

FY 2010 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2012.

State and LEA Allocations

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas are eligible to apply to receive a School Improvement Grant. The Department will allocate FY 2010 school improvement funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2010 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its school improvement funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

Appendix A provides guidance on how SEAs can maximize the number of Tier I and Tier II schools its LEAs can serve with FY 2009 carryover and FY 2010 SIG funds when making their LEA allocations for the FY 2010 competition. See Appendix A for a more detailed explanation.

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

Before submitting its application for a SIG grant to the Department, an SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein. The Department recommends that the SEA also consult with other stakeholders, such as potential external providers, teachers' unions, and business, civil rights, and community leaders that have an interest in its application.

FY 2010 Submission Information

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2010 School Improvement Grant (SIG) application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, not as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2010 application to the following address: school.improvement.grants@ed.gov

In addition, the SEA must submit a paper copy of the cover page signed by the SEA's authorized representative to the address listed below under "Paper Submission."

Paper Submission:

If an SEA is not able to submit its application electronically, it may submit the original and two copies of its SIG application to the following address:

Carlas McCauley, Education Program Specialist
Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W320
Washington, DC 20202-6132

Due to potential delays in government processing of mail sent through the U.S. Postal Service, SEAs are encouraged to use alternate carriers for paper submissions.

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before December 3, 2010.

For Further Information

If you have any questions, please contact Carlas McCauley at (202) 260-0824 or by e-mail at carlas.mccauley@ed.gov.

FY 2010 Application Instructions

Most of the FY 2010 SIG application is identical to the FY 2009 application. A new section for additional evaluation criteria (Section B-1) has been added and Section H on Waivers has been expanded. Section D on Descriptive Information (Section D – Part 1, Section D – Parts 2-8) has also been reformatted into two separate sections for the FY 2010 application, but all other parts of the application remain the same.

Consequently, except as provided below, an SEA must update only those sections that include changes from the FY 2009 application. In particular, the Department expects that most SEAs will be able to retain Section B on Evaluation Criteria, Section C on Capacity, and Section D (parts 2-8) on Descriptive Information, sections that make up the bulk of the SIG application. An SEA has the option to update any of the material in these sections if it so desires.

We are requiring SEAs to update some sections of the SIG application to ensure that each SEA focuses its FY 2010 SIG funds, including any funds carried over from FY 2009, on serving its persistently lowest-achieving schools in LEAs with the capacity and commitment to fully and effectively implement one of the four required school intervention models beginning in the 2011-2012 school year.

Note that while an SEA may be able to submit significant portions of its FY 2010 SIG application unchanged from FY 2009, we recommend that it review all sections of the FY 2010 application to ensure alignment with any required changes or revisions.

SEAs should also note that they will only be able to insert information in designated spaces (form fields) in the application because of formatting restrictions. Clicking on a section of the application that is restricted will automatically jump the cursor to the next form field which may cause users to skip over information in the application. Users may avoid this issue by using the scroll bar to review the application. However, due to these restrictions, the Department recommends that SEAs print a copy of the application and review it in its entirety before filling out the form.

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Michigan Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: P.O. Box 30008 Lansing, MI 48909
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Linda Forward Position and Office: Director, Office of Education Improvement and Innovation Contact's Mailing Address: P.O. Box 30008 Lansing MI 48909 Telephone: 517-241-3147 Fax: 517-241-2540 Email address: forwardl@michigan.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Michael P. Flanagan	Telephone: 517-373-3823
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X	Date:
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

FY 2010 Application Checklist

Please use this checklist to serve as a roadmap for the SEA's FY 2010 application.

Please note that an SEA's submission for FY 2010 must include the following attachments, as indicated on the application form:

- Lists, by LEA, of the State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.
- A copy of the SEA's FY 2010 LEA application form that LEAs will use to apply to the SEA for a School Improvement Grant.
- If the SEA seeks any waivers through its application, a copy of the notice it provided to LEAs and a copy of any comments it received from LEAs as well as a copy of, or link to, the notice the SEA provided to the public.

Please check the relevant boxes below to verify that all required sections of the SEA application are included and to indicate which sections of the FY 2010 application the SEA has revised from its FY 2009 application.

SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
	<p><i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 (SEA is requesting waiver)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has less than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to generate new lists</p>	<p><i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition</p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lists, by LEA, of State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools provided	
SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section B-1: Additional evaluation criteria provided	
SECTION C: CAPACITY	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION D (PART 1): TIMELINE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section D (Part 1): Timeline provided	
SECTION D (PARTS 2-8): DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION E: ASSURANCES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section E: Assurances provided	
SECTION F: SEA RESERVATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section F: SEA reservations provided	
SECTION G: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section G: Consultation with stakeholders provided	
SECTION H: WAIVERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section H: Waivers provided	

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

As part of its application for a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, an SEA must provide the following information.

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS: An SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State. (A State's Tier I and Tier II schools are its persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if the SEA so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools that are as low achieving as the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.) In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years. In addition, the SEA must indicate whether it has exercised the option to identify as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school a school that was made newly eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

Each SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools based on the State's most recent achievement and graduation rate data to ensure that LEAs continue to give priority to using SIG funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in each of their persistently lowest-achieving schools, rather than using SIG funds to support less rigorous improvement measures in less needy schools. However, any SEA that has five or more Tier I schools that were identified for purposes of the State's FY 2009 SIG competition but are not being served with SIG funds in the 2010-2011 school year may apply for a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists.

An SEA also has the option of making changes to its FY 2009 definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools". An SEA that exercises this option must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Regardless of whether it modifies its definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" or generates new lists, along with its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, an SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop these lists. The SEA may provide a link to the page on its Web site where its definition is posted, or it may attach the complete definition to its application.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
<p><i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. SEA has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 and is therefore eligible to request a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists of schools. Lists and waiver request submitted below.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>SEA is electing not to include newly eligible schools for the FY 2010 competition. (Only applicable if the SEA elected to add newly eligible schools in FY 2009.)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has fewer than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009. Lists submitted below.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3. SEA elects to generate new lists. Lists submitted below.</p>	<p><i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” Lists submitted below.</p>

<p>Insert definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or link to definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” here: (See Attachment I)</p>
--

An SEA must attach two tables to its SIG application. The first table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that are eligible for FY 2010 SIG funds. The second table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that were served with FY 2009 SIG funds.

Please create these two tables in Excel and use the formats shown below. Examples of the tables have been provided for guidance.

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE [†]

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS							
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	TAYLOR MS	##			X		X
LEA 2	##	WASHINGTON ES	##	X				
LEA 2	##	FILLMORE HS	##			X		
LEA 3	##	TYLER HS	##		X		X	
LEA 4	##	VAN BUREN MS	##	X				
LEA 4	##	POLK ES	##			X		

[†] “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about “newly eligible schools,” please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS							
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE
LEA 1	##	MONROE ES	##	X			
LEA 1	##	JEFFERSON HS	##		X		X
LEA 2	##	ADAMS ES	##	X			
LEA 3	##	JACKSON ES	##	X			

Please attach the two tables in a separate file and submit it with the application.

☒ **SEA has attached the two tables in a separate file and submitted it with its application.**

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Part 1: The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA's application with respect to each of the following actions:

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.
- (2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.
- (3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

Part 2: The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant, but most likely will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, an SEA must describe the criteria it will use to assess the LEA's commitment to do the following:

- (1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.
- (2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.
- (3) Align other resources with the interventions.
- (4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.
- (5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

☐ SEA is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009.

☒ SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for FY 2010.

Insert response to Section B Evaluation Criteria here:

A copy of the LEA application is provided as **Attachment III**. The application includes a scoring rubric (**Attachment IV**) that will be used to evaluate the information provided in the LEA application.

- (1) Describe how the LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II School identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.**

The SEA will look for evidence that the LEA has done a thorough analysis of data using the data components in the state's Comprehensive Needs Assessment tool or other similar reliable analysis of school and student data to identify needs and select one of the four turnaround models to be implemented.

All districts and schools in Michigan are required to complete a Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) every three – five years. The CNA analyzes the student achievement data as well as system processes and protocols of practice that are in place to support student achievement.

The CNA consists of three sections:

- o **Data Profile and Analysis:** Assesses current student achievement data and information about the district. The report includes: 1) identification of student learning goals; 2) gaps between current student achievement and goals for student achievement; and 3) identification of contributing causes for gaps in achievement. Data used to analyze student achievement includes: State Assessment Data, local test data, and annual report cards.
- o **Process Profile and Analysis:** Assesses the system processes and protocols of practice that are in place to support student academic achievement. The assessment focuses on the Key Characteristics contained in the School Improvement Framework Rubrics. The School Process Rubric and data analysis can be found at the following web addresses:
 - o School Process Rubric
 - http://www.advanc-ed.org/sites/advanc-ed.org/files/wfm/assets/spr_template.doc

- Data Analysis
 - http://help.advanced.org/templates/school_data_profile_template.doc

- **Comprehensive Summary Report:** Provides a format to align identified student achievement challenges with system challenges. This report will provide the LEA with information for developing the district improvement plan.

Information from the CNA is used to set specific, measurable goals for each school. This forms the base of an improvement plan that is monitored and revised as needed, but at least annually.

The SEA rubric (**Attachment IV**) will judge the following elements in the LEA application:

1. Analysis of student achievement data
2. Analysis of teacher, principal data
3. Inclusion of perception data
4. Assessment of system processes
5. Use of analyses to select turnaround model
6. Inclusion of external partner for turnaround model

- (2) Describe how the LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.

Capacity is discussed in greater detail below in Section C. The SEA will look for evidence of adequate funding to support the turnaround model selected and the process. SEA rubric (**Attachment IV**) will include the following:

1. Appropriate funding for described activities.
2. Selection of a district level coordinator responsible for local monitoring and oversight of the turnaround.
3. Selection of an external partner to provide support.
4. Evidence of commitment of school teachers and leaders to the turnaround effort.
5. Evidence of school board support for the turnaround effort
6. Evidence of community inclusion and support for the turnaround effort
7. Evidence of what the LEA will do differently to produce student achievement
8. Evidence of financial stability and fiscal responsibility

- (3) Describe how the LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

As grants and budgets from the LEA are received, they will be reviewed to ensure that they have adequately budgeted for activities to support the intervention they select. Each identified Tier I and Tier II school may receive up to \$2,000,000 per year to improve the levels of student achievement and graduation rates through the use of one of the turnaround models.

The SEA rubric (**Attachment IV**) will include the following:

1. Budget includes necessary personnel and activities to implement selected turnaround model
2. Budget items are reasonable and necessary
3. Budget covers allowable timeline (SEA is requesting waiver to extend availability of funds through Sept 30, 2014)
4. Budget includes all required elements of turnaround model(s)
5. Plan includes demonstration of capacity building and longer term sustainability for Tier I and II schools
6. Activities planned for Tier III schools leverage investments they are making in Tier I and II schools

Part 2

The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant but, most likely, will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, an SEA must describe how it will assess the LEA's commitment to do the following:

- (1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

MDE will review the LEA applications to find evidence that all required elements are addressed for each turnaround model chosen for a Tier I or Tier II school. Implementation will be monitored by facilitator/monitors assigned to each Tier I or Tier II school served by the SIG funds.

Any Tier III schools served by LEAs with SIG funds will be required to participate in the Statewide System of Support (SSOS) and monitored through the SSOS processes. (**Attachment V**)

MDE will review the LEA application to find evidence of a district level assignment to oversee and monitor the implementation of LEA turnaround model(s).

(2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

The Michigan Department of Education will recruit and screen external providers, and provide a list of preferred providers to LEAs. If LEAs do not select from the state list, the provider selected by the LEA must also go through the state approval process prior to engaging in the turnaround intervention. See **Attachment VI** for the external provider application and rubric.

The LEA's will be responsible to contract with an external provider(s). External providers will be required to participate in a state-run training program that specifies performance expectations and familiarizes providers with state legislation and regulations. External providers will be evaluated regularly and those that are not getting results will be removed from the preferred list.

(3) Align other resources with the interventions.

MDE will review LEA applications for evidence of the coordinated use of funds to implement the interventions specified by the LEA. See the attached LEA application (**Attachment III**) Budget section for the resources suggested for possible coordination and implementation and for budget details.

(4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

MDE will review LEA applications for evidence of change in practice and policy. Examples of change could include:

- teacher commitment to implement the selected intervention
- principal operational authority
- removal of other initiatives from school to allow intervention to be the sole focus
- releasing school staff from unrelated professional development activities
- appointment of a district level person to coordinate and oversee intervention
- evidence of school board support to implement intervention

(5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

MDE recognizes that reforms take time and money to implement, and that LEA's will need to work from the start to build mechanisms for sustainability. When districts apply for the grant they must demonstrate the following:

- Willingness to work with an external provider to review the district's current budget and identify potential funds
- Commitment to supporting either through district funds, foundations, or other contributions the reforms after the end of the grant period.

In addition to the specifications outlined above, MDE has in place a tiered approach to monitoring (See section D) which captures the districts' ongoing commitment and success in each of these areas. This includes:

- Required participation by districts and schools (along with their vendors of choice) in a network of all Tier I and Tier II schools focused on sharing of performance metrics and progress across groups of similar schools, sharing of successful practices, mechanisms for bringing research, best practices, and targeted supports into the schools;
- Frequent site visits by MDE facilitator/monitors;
- Required data reporting

MDE will review LEA applications for evidence that the LEA has identified or has a plan to identify funding to sustain the intervention. Indicators of sustainability could include:

- a. Clear plan to coordinate the use of federal, state and local funds to implement the intervention(s)
- b. Budget detail and narrative showing School Improvement funds as supplemental and capacity building, not operational, and a decreasing need for supplemental funding over the life of the grant
- c. Narrative detail that indicates external supports will be decreased and school personnel will take on leadership of the turnaround
- d. Indication that accountability measures would continue after the life of the School Improvement Grant

B-1. ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA: In addition to the evaluation criteria listed in Section B, the SEA must evaluate the following information in an LEA's budget and application:

Please note that Section B-1 is a new section added for the FY 2010 application.

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period² to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable? *(For a description of allowable activities during the pre-implementation period, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.)*

² "Pre-implementation" enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011–2012 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds in its SIG schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application, consistent with the SIG final requirements. As soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG-related activities in schools that will be served with FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.

Insert response to Section B-1 Additional Evaluation Criteria here:

1. Prior to release of funds, the SEA will review all proposed first-year budgeted activities from pre-implementation through implementation to assure that pre-implementation activities are allowable and directly related to the implementation of the intervention model identified by the LEA as meeting its needs to improve student achievement. Reviewers will also evaluate whether adequate funds remain after pre-implementation activities to fund the activities planned during the first year of the grant.
2. The SEA will first review the proposed implementation activities to determine whether they are reasonable, necessary and directly related to the first-year implementation plan of the intervention model selected. If the activities pass this screen, reviewers will then look to the guidance to determine whether the proposed activities fall into allowable areas such as family and community engagement that is designed to engage the broader school "family" in the implementation plan; screening and recruiting external providers who bring expertise to the implementation of the plan; recruiting and interviewing staff; providing remediation or supplemental instruction for students prior to the start of the school year; piloting teacher and principal evaluation systems; and any other allowable activities that will lead to the implementation of the intervention model at the start of the school year.

C. CAPACITY: The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school.

An LEA that applies for a School Improvement Grant must serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four school intervention models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the SEA must evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. Claims of lack of capacity should be scrutinized carefully to ensure that LEAs effectively intervene in as many of their Tier I schools as possible.

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement any of the school intervention models in its Tier I school(s). The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

☒ SEA is using the same evaluation criteria for capacity as FY 2009.

☐ SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for capacity for FY 2010.

1. Evaluation of a district's capacity

All LEAs receiving School Improvement Grants will work with an external partner. If the LEA demonstrates lack of capacity, MDE will work with the LEA and ISD to find an alternative governance structure for the Tier I or II school(s). MDE will review LEA applications for capacity as described above in Section B, Part 1(2). In addition to this review, if an LEA claims lack of sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I or Tier II school, the LEA must submit written notification along with the School Improvement Grant application that it cannot serve all Tier I schools. The notification must be signed by the District Superintendent or Public School Academy Administrator and the President of the local school board. *Notifications must include both signatures to be considered.*

The notification must include the following:

- A completed online Michigan District Comprehensive Needs Assessment indicating that the district was able to attain only a "getting "started" or "Partially Implemented" rating (link below) in

- at least 15 of the 19 areas with a description of efforts to improve.
- http://www.advanc-ed.org/sites/advanc-ed.org/files/wfm/assets/district_spr_template.doc
- Evidence that the district lacks personnel with the skills and knowledge to work with struggling schools. This includes a description of education levels and experience of all leadership positions as well as a listing of teachers who are teaching out of certification levels.

2. If the MDE determines that the district does have capacity to implement one of the four intervention models, MDE will take the following actions:

- Notify the LEA that the SEA has determined that the district does have capacity, based on information submitted in its School Improvement Grant application and other available information
- Require that the LEA submit a revised SIG application within 60 days. This revised application and plan may be facilitated by a mentor team or an external provider and include the following:
 1. A description of how resources (human, financial and capital) will be redistributed to address perceived capacity issues
 2. A timeline for when and how this redistribution will occur
 3. The name(s) of the person(s) responsible for the redistribution
 4. Benchmarks for the LEA reporting progress to MDE at least quarterly, but in some cases, a more frequent reporting cycle may be required by SEA
 5. The facilitator/monitor assigned to the Tier I school will report on the progress by the LEA in implementing its plan

3. If the SEA determines that a district does not have capacity to implement any of the four intervention models allowed by the School Improvement Grant guidelines, the SEA will take the following action:

Secure a Memorandum of Understanding between the LEA and the ISD or other external partner describing at least the following:

- The turnaround model selected for each of the Tier I and Tier II schools
- A description of the external partner selected from the state's

preferred list

- A description of how resources (human, financial and capital) will be redistributed to address perceived capacity issues
- A timeline for when and how this redistribution will occur
- The name(s) of the person(s) responsible for the redistribution
- Benchmarks for the district reporting progress to MDE
- The facilitator/monitor assigned to the school will report on the progress by the LEA in implementing its plan

If the LEA cannot submit an acceptable plan or refuses to submit a School Improvement Grant application for a Tier I or Tier II school, newly passed state legislation allows the State School Reform/Redesign Officer to place the school(s) into the State Reform District and select and implement one of the four turnaround interventions. (Public Act 204 of 2009)

D (PART 1). TIMELINE: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

Please note that Section D has been reformatted to separate the timeline into a different section for the FY 2010 application.

Upon approval of application to USED, MDE will release the LEA application. Our tentative timeline is as follows:

- LEA application released within 15 days of approval by U. S. Department of Education
- LEA applications due to MDE within 60 days of release of the LEA application
- MDE will issue preliminary awards to districts, unless negotiation is needed, within 90 days after receipt from LEA

To facilitate an effective application process, MDE will host a technical assistance meeting with all LEAs that have eligible Tier I, II, and III schools and with the ISD leaders in those regions. ISD leaders have been actively engaged in school improvement and will provide assistance to LEAs in the application and planning for the School Improvement intervention(s). Rapid disbursement of grant funds is needed to allow LEAs to begin the recruitment, hiring, and professional development over the spring and summer.

D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

(2) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

(3) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals.

(4) Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA is approved to serve.

(5) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.

(6) Describe the criteria, if any, that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.

(7) If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, identify those schools and indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school.

(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.³

³ If, at the time an SEA submits its application, it has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, it may omit this information from its application. However, if the SEA later decides that it will provide such services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

☐ SEA is using the same descriptive information as FY 2009.

☒ SEA has revised its descriptive information for FY 2010.

Insert response to Section D (Parts 2-8) Descriptive Information here:

<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 50px; width: 100%;"></div>

(2) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant if one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

The desired outcome of intensive intervention is rapid improvement in student learning. Baseline data on student achievement and other indicators as available will be gathered from the year preceding the grant award. LEAs will be expected to set rigorous, achievable goals to increase academic performance each year. In addition to the annual statewide assessment required by ESEA, LEAs will be expected to specify and use interim assessments to provide regular achievement progress reports. LEAs receiving School Improvement Grant funds for a Tier I or Tier II high school will also be required to administer the Explore, and Plan assessments to provide a measure of annual growth at the high school level. (Michigan uses the ACT as part of its annual state assessment for high school students.)

The LEA goals for student achievement as identified in the grant application will be reviewed quarterly and annually to assess progress. In order for the grant to be renewed, the LEA must demonstrate it is meeting at least 75% of the state-approved goals in the identified schools. These goals will also be reviewed in the context of the Michigan School Improvement Framework (SIF) available at the following URL: http://www.michigan.gov/documents/SIF_4-01-05_130701_7.pdf. LEAs must demonstrate a strong ongoing commitment to the five strands of the SIF:

- Teaching for Learning
- Leadership
- Personnel & Professional learning
- School & Community Relations
- Data & Information Management

School level data will be annually reviewed to assess progress in meeting the leading indicators defined in the final requirements. The LEA must demonstrate that identified schools have met or are making progress toward meeting the leading indicators below:

- An increase in the number of minutes within the school year
- An increase in student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student

subgroup

- A decrease in the dropout rate
- An increase in the student attendance rate
- An increase in the number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes
- A decrease in discipline incidents
- A decrease in truancy
- A distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system
- A steady or increasing rate of teacher attendance

"Making progress" is defined by providing evidence that the identified school is making steady progress toward the established goals, such as, steady increases in student achievement, the institution of annual teacher evaluation based, in part, on student impact, timely and appropriate expenditure of funds, and implementation of the intervention as planned. Facilitator/monitors will provide at least quarterly reports for the Tier I and II schools and MDE will gather data for annual reports on goals and leading indicators to make a decision on grant renewal each year.

In addition, MDE will engage in the broader national discussion about performance measure and acceptable progress, and as data becomes available, will benchmark schools progress against successful turnaround schools in other states, to determine whether appropriate targets have been set.

(3) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant if one or more Tier III schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals.

The state-approved annual goals for Tier III schools for student achievement will be reviewed to ensure the LEA is meeting or making progress toward meeting them. Title I schools that are designated as Tier III will participate in Michigan's Statewide System Of Support (SSOS). (*Attachment V*) One of the elements of the SSOS, process mentors, provides quarterly visits to the LEA to review actions and outcomes toward the school improvement goals for the designated schools. An LEA not meeting or making progress toward of the goals for that school will not have its grant renewed for the Tier III school.

"Making progress" is defined by providing evidence the LEA and the identified school have documented the actions taken to implement school improvement plans. Progress will also be measured by student achievement gains that are equal to or greater than the average gain for the state as measured by MEAP or MME.

(4) Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA is approved to serve.

MDE plans to implement a tiered approach to monitoring. This includes:

- Frequent site visits by MDE facilitator/monitors;
- Participation in a school network
- Required data reporting

Participation in a school network

The concept of school turnaround at scale is new for the State of Michigan. As such, MDE proposes to implement a facilitated peer accountability network of Tier I and Tier II schools (except those selecting closure) which would include school teams, district representatives, and external provider leads. The network would engage in the following key activities in small or large group settings 4-6 times per year:

- Establishing common processes and benchmarks for performance reporting across all schools
- Providing critical feedback across schools on practices and performance
- Gathering and sharing data on successful practices
- Identifying challenges and resource gaps in Michigan
- Providing research, best practices, and access to national experts on key areas of reform
- Providing feedback to MDE on how we can improve our supports to low performing schools.

Facilitator/Monitor Visits

During the pre-implementation phase, each grant LEA will receive a visit from a facilitator/monitor every three-four weeks to evaluate progress and assure that the initial grant activities and corresponding budget items are being implemented as presented in their approved plan. With the beginning of school year 2011-2012,

each Tier I and Tier II school will receive weekly facilitator/monitor visits. Facilitator/monitors will evaluate local progress and provide guidance in meeting the student achievement goals and the selected intervention model. Site visits will decrease in frequency as progress on meeting the goals continues; however, all Tier I and Tier II schools will continue to receive at least a monthly facilitator/monitor visit for the duration of the grant.

A decrease in site visits for a school site will be predicated on: direct observation/evaluation of the facilitator/monitor and progress as documented on quarterly reports. Schools that are demonstrating excellence or innovation in implementing their intervention model will be asked to share their methodology, experiences, and approaches both regionally and statewide with other LEAs.

Facilitator/monitors will work with LEAs to submit annual reports to the SEA detailing the LEA's efforts and progress in implementing the selected intervention model and providing the required data on leading indicators and goals.

(5) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.

In the event the SEA does not have sufficient funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies, priority will be given to Tier I and Tier II schools in LEAs that demonstrate the strongest plans and commitment to implement fully and effectively one of the rigorous interventions (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) as described in the Final Requirements as amended in January 2010. Weight will also be given to the school's poverty rate and level of proficiency in mathematics and reading.

(6) Describe the criteria, if any, which the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.

If necessary, the SEA will prioritize Tier III schools based on their location in an LEA that contains Tier I and/or Tier II schools. Next in priority are schools that have proficiency levels as low or lower than Tier I and II schools and are in LEAs in the lowest performing decile.

(7) If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, identify those schools and indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each

school.

The SEA does not intend to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools at this time. However, Michigan recently passed legislation (Public Act 201 of 2009) that will allow the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to appoint a State School Reform/Redesign Officer (SSRRO), who will oversee and monitor the progress of the lowest performing schools. An interim SSRRO has been appointed and plans are underway to establish the State School Reform Office. Funding was appropriated by the state legislature for 12 FTEs to ensure coordination of efforts between the State School Reform Office and the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation, the Office of Education Assessment and Accountability and the Grants Office. If the SSRRO places schools into the State Redesign District and takes direct control, the SEA will submit to the USED a list of identified Tier I or Tier II schools it will take over and the interventions to be implemented in each school.

(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school, and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.

The SEA does not intend to provide any direct services to any schools in the context of the absence of a takeover. However, the SEA intends to provide direct support to all Tier I and Tier II schools in the context of evaluating progress on meeting the goals for student achievement (Tier I and Tier II schools are identified in section A of this application). As noted in #3 above, the SEA will begin this process by establishing a network of support and providing weekly facilitator/ monitor visits, decreasing to monthly visits as schools make progress on the goals.

The SEA has released a vetted list of external service providers that are available to assist schools in implementing their selected intervention model.

- If, at the time an SEA submits its application, it has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, it may omit this information from its application. However, if the SEA later decides that it will provide such services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

E. ASSURANCES

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that it will do the following (check each box):

- ☒ Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.
- ☒ Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- ☒ Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.
- ☒ Monitor each LEA's implementation of the "rigorous review process" of recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers as well as the interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- ☒ To the extent a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- ☒ Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.
- ☒ Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.

F. SEA RESERVATION: The SEA may reserve an amount not to exceed five percent of its School Improvement Grant for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses.

The SEA must briefly describe the activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance that the SEA plans to conduct with any State-level funds it chooses to reserve from its School Improvement Grant allocation.

The Michigan Department of Education will engage in the following activities:

Administration

Infrastructure

MDE recognizes that this is a new kind of work for the department. As such, the state has employed and trained staff and consultants to carry out the state led activities. Staff time is allocated to developing and enhancing structures, processes, and tools to implement the functions of the grant on an ongoing basis. Where necessary, staff will work with LEAs who are experiencing the complex issues that arise when dealing with multiple buildings who have received SIG grants. Additionally, staff time is allocated for federal reporting requirements as well as for integration within MDE across other programs and funding streams including traditional Title I and II funds, IDEA, and other statewide initiatives such as the teacher evaluation project.

RFP Process for Districts and Vendors

The state is enhancing existing tools in order to support the implementation of the School Improvement Grant processes and activities. We will communicate with eligible districts and convene a meeting to facilitate their completion of the application. MDE will provide support to districts in the vendor selection process. Applications for renewal and new applications will be completed through the Michigan Electronic Grants System (MEGS). The system includes an online application and end-of-award reporting mechanism. Utilizing the MEGS process will enhance the ability to collect data about the reform models selected by the schools, planned activities and the funding attached to the funding, and final reporting through the state's grants closure systems.

The state will also issue and manage an RFP process for vendors which will include an informational meeting or webcast. MDE will also develop a training session for vendors to familiarize them with the MI system of

support and requirements.

In addition, the state will establish and maintain partnership agreements with each district. The MDE will meet with the leadership of selected LEAs to review the expectations of the grant, the application process, and implementation expectations. Follow up meetings will be held to assist the LEA leadership.

Once the new leadership of the buildings have been selected, they will be invited to the Teaching for Learning Institute to participate in a strand developed for them to address implementation issues including fidelity theory, and to work with the Facilitator Monitor and ISD/RESA coach. The Teaching for Learning Institute will be one of many opportunities for SIG recipients to convene as a professional network.

Process Mentors

SIG recipients who are Title I receiving schools are presently in the SSOS. These services will continue with the Process Mentors acting as Case Managers to assure that the SSOS services and the SIG activities are coherent.

Data Collection and Reporting

The state will use the existing Center for Educational Performance Information (CEPI) to track the performance of the students and to track leading indicators. The system collects data on students, school personnel, and financial records. These data will be enhanced to include data specific to the School Improvement Grant. Finally, the system to identify schools in the lowest 5%, 10%, and quintile will be automated to allow for rapid and accurate identification of schools eligible to participate in the grant.

The staff responsible for administering the grant will be enhanced through the addition of financial analysts who will assure rapid awards to the LEA's, tracking of expenditures by the LEA's, reporting on the 1512, managing a system to track progress on the implementation of activities and reports from the Facilitator Monitors regarding the progress of the school toward meeting interim targets and benchmarks leading to improved student achievement.

Technical Assistance

Technical assistance includes the assignment of a Facilitator/Monitor to each participating school and the implementation of a Partnership Network of schools, districts, and vendors all working to turn around schools. Each

of these components is described below.

Facilitator/Monitors

MDE will identify and hire or contract (as consultants) a group of facilitator/monitors as described in section D(4). The Facilitator/Monitors will visit the schools weekly in the early months of the implementation process to gauge the progress made by the schools and to discuss any barriers that may be inhibiting the progress. Where barriers exist, the Facilitator/Monitor will work with LEA personnel to assure that the barriers are removed. Facilitator/monitors will provide early warning to help the interventions stay on track. ISD/ESA administrators will engage with LEAs to enhance their capacity as described in **Attachment VII** with a Partnership Agreement for LEAs that need additional support or alternative governance.

Partnership Network

As described in section D(4), MDE will facilitate a partnership network with required representation from districts, schools, and vendors. Participants will be expected to budget their time and travel to participate in their individual school budgets. MDE will support the planning and execution of activities, including bringing in consultants and national experts to work with the network. We anticipate large group meetings 4-6 times per year, with smaller learning communities meeting more frequently.

State and National Networking

MDE staff and consultants will participate in meetings and conferences with other states to gather information about best practices and benchmarks, and bring that information back into Michigan.

Evaluation

MDE staff and consultants will provide the necessary information to USED for the larger, federal evaluation. In addition, MDE proposes to conduct the following evaluative activities:

- Determine appropriate baseline data to collect
- Routinely analyze indicator data through and interactive process to track performance
- Conduct formative and summative evaluations
- Conduct case studies as funds allow.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: The SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners and is encouraged to consult with other stakeholders regarding its application for a School Improvement Grant.

Before submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant to the Department, the SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein.

☒ The SEA has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application.

The SEA may also consult with other stakeholders that have an interest in its application.

☒ The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including intermediate schools districts.

H. WAIVERS: SEAs are invited to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must check the corresponding box(es) to indicate which waiver(s) it is requesting.

WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here Michigan requests a waiver of the State-level requirements it has indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and raise the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

☐ In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

☒ The State assures that it will include in the pool of schools from which it identifies its Tier II schools all Title I secondary schools not identified in Tier I that either (1) have not made AYP for at least two consecutive years; or (2) are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined. Within that pool, the State assures that it will identify as Tier II schools the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with its approved definition. The State is attaching the list of schools and their level of achievement (as determined under paragraph (b) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools”) that would be identified as Tier II schools without the waiver and those that would be identified with the waiver. The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to use SIG funds in a Title I secondary school that becomes an eligible Tier II school based on this waiver will comply with the SIG final requirements for serving that school.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the Tier II waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

☒ In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than **[Please indicate number]** 30.

Assurance

☒ The State assures that it determined whether it needs to identify five percent of schools or five schools in each tier prior to excluding small schools below its “minimum n.” The State is attaching, and will post on its Web site, a list of the schools in each tier that it will exclude under this waiver and the number of students in each school on which that determination is based. The State will include its “minimum n” in its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” In addition, the State will include in its list of Tier III schools any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with this waiver.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the n-size waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 3: New list waiver

☐ Because the State neither must nor elects to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, waive Sections I.A.1 and II.B.10 of the SIG final requirements to permit the State to use the same Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III lists it used for its FY 2009 competition.

Assurance

☐ The State assures that it has five or more unserved Tier I schools on its FY 2009 list.

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here Michigan requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA’s application for a grant.

The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State’s Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 4: School improvement timeline waiver

☒ Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2011–2012 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

☒ The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or restart model beginning in 2011–2012 in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

☒ The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2010-2011 school year cannot

request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.

Waiver 5: Schoolwide program waiver

☒ Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four school intervention models.

Assurances

☒ The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

☒ The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY WAIVER

Enter State Name Here Michigan requests a waiver of the requirement indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 6: Period of availability of FY 2009 carryover funds waiver

☒ Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2014.

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2009 carryover funds. An SEA that requested and received this waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver to apply to FY 2009 carryover funds in order to make them available for three full years for schools awarded SIG funds through the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

ASSURANCE OF NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD – APPLIES TO ALL WAIVER REQUESTS
(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)

☒ The State assures that, prior to submitting its School Improvement Grant application, the State provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a School Improvement Grant with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on its waiver request(s) and has attached a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs. The State also assures that it provided notice and information regarding the above waiver request(s) to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (e.g., by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its Web site) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice.

PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs. That application must contain, at a minimum, the information set forth below. An SEA may include other information that it deems necessary in order to award school improvement funds to its LEAs.

Please note that for FY 2010, an SEA must develop or update its LEA application form to include information on any activities, as well as the budget for those activities, that LEAs plan to carry out during the pre-implementation period to help prepare for full implementation in the following school year.

The SEA must submit its LEA application form with its application to the Department for a School Improvement Grant. The SEA should attach the LEA application form in a separate document.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

Note: An LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that—
 - The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school; and
 - The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- (2) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - Align other resources with the interventions;
 - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application.
- (5) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.
- (7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

C. BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application.

Note: An LEA's budget should cover three years of full implementation and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be included in the first year of the LEA's three-year budget plan.

An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 or no more than \$6,000,000 over three years.

Example:

LEA XX BUDGET					
	Year 1 Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three-Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation			
Tier I ES #1	\$257,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,325,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,938,000
Tier I ES #2	\$125,500	\$890,500	\$846,500	\$795,000	\$2,657,500
Tier I MS #1	\$304,250	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$4,800,000
Tier II HS #1	\$530,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,960,000	\$1,775,000	\$5,735,000
LEA-level Activities	\$250,000		\$250,000	\$250,000	\$750,000
Total Budget	\$6,279,000		\$5,981,500	\$5,620,000	\$17,880,500

D. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

E. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA’s School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- ☐ “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- ☐ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

APPENDIX A

SEA ALLOCATIONS TO LEAS AND LEA BUDGETS

Continuing Impact of ARRA School Improvement Grant Funding in FY 2010

Congress appropriated \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in FY 2010. In addition, most States will be carrying over a portion of their FY 2009 SIG allocations, primarily due to the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG final requirements that if not every Tier I school in a State was served with FY 2009 SIG funds, the State was required to carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation, combine those funds with the State's FY 2010 SIG allocation, and award the combined funding to eligible LEAs consistent with the SIG final requirements. In FY 2009, the combination of \$3 billion in School Improvement Grant funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and \$546 million from the regular FY 2009 appropriation created a unique opportunity for the program to provide the substantial funding over a multi-year period to support the implementation of school intervention models. In response to this opportunity, the Department encouraged States to apply for a waiver extending the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds until September 30, 2013 so that States could use these funds to make three-year grant awards to LEAs to support the full and effective implementation of school intervention models in their Tier I and Tier II schools. All States with approved FY 2009 SIG applications applied for and received this waiver to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds and, consistent with the final SIG requirements, are using FY 2009 funds to provide a full three years of funding (aka, "frontloading") to support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.

The Department encouraged frontloading in FY 2009 because the extraordinary amount of SIG funding available in FY 2009 meant that, if those funds had been used to fund only the first year of implementation of a school intervention model, *i.e.*, to make first-year only awards, there would not have been sufficient funding for continuation awards in years two and three of the SIG award period (*i.e.*, SIG funding in FY 2009 was seven times the amount provided through the regular appropriation). Similarly, the estimated nearly \$1.4 billion in total SIG funding available in FY 2010 (an estimated \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG carryover funds plus the \$546 million FY 2010 SIG appropriation) is larger than the expected annual SIG appropriation over the next two fiscal years; if all funds available in FY 2010 were used to make the first year of three-year awards to LEAs for services to eligible Tier I and Tier II schools, there would not be sufficient funds to make continuation awards in subsequent fiscal years.

Maximizing the Impact of Regular FY 2010 SIG Allocations

Continuing the practice of frontloading SIG funds in FY 2010 with respect to all SIG funds that are available for the FY 2010 competition (FY 2009 carryover funds plus the FY 2010 appropriation) would, in many States, limit the number of Tier I and Tier II schools that can be served as a result of the FY 2010 SIG competition. For this reason, the Department believes that, for most States, the most effective method of awarding FY 2010 SIG funds to serve the maximum number of Tier I and Tier II schools that have the capacity to fully and effectively implement a school intervention model is to frontload FY 2009 carryover funds while using FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year only awards.

For example, if a State has \$36 million in FY 2009 carryover SIG funds and \$21 million in FY 2010 funds, and awards each school implementing a school intervention model an average of \$1 million per year over three years, the SEA would be able to fund 12 schools with FY 2009 carryover funds (*i.e.*, the \$36 million would cover all three years of funding for those 12 schools), plus an additional 21 schools with FY 2010 funds (*i.e.*, the \$21 million would cover the first year of funding for each of those schools, and the second and third years would be funded through continuation grants from subsequent SIG appropriations). Thus, the State would be able to support interventions in a total of 33 schools. However, if the same State elected to frontload all funds available for its FY 2010 SIG competition (FY 2009 carryover funds and its FY 2010 allocation), it would be able to fund interventions in only 19 schools (\$57 million divided by \$3 million per school over three years).

LEAs that receive first-year only awards would continue to implement intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools over a three-year award period; however, second- and third-year continuation grants would be awarded from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years. This practice of making first-year awards from one year's appropriation and continuation awards from funds appropriated in subsequent fiscal years is similar to the practice used for many U.S. Department of Education discretionary grant programs.

States with FY 2009 SIG carryover funds are invited to apply, as in their FY 2009 applications, for the waiver to extend the period of availability of these funds for one additional year to September 30, 2014. States that did not carry over FY 2009 SIG funds, or that carried over only a small amount of such funds, need not apply for this waiver; such States will use all available FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year awards to LEAs in their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

Continuation of \$2 Million Annual Per School Cap

For FY 2010, States continue to have flexibility to award up to \$2 million annually for each participating school. This flexibility applies both to funds that are frontloaded and those that are used for first-year only awards. As in FY 2009, this higher limit will permit an SEA to award the amount that the Department believes typically would be required for the successful

implementation of the turnaround, restart, or transformation model in a Tier I or Tier II school (e.g., a school of 500 students might require \$1 million annually, whereas a large, comprehensive high school might require the full \$2 million annually).

In addition, the annual \$2 million per school cap, which permits total per-school funding of up to \$6 million over three years, reflects the continuing priority on serving Tier I or Tier II schools. An SEA must ensure that all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve, and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve, are awarded sufficient school improvement funding to fully and effectively implement the selected school intervention models over the period of availability of the funds before the SEA awards any funds for Tier III schools.

The following describes the requirements and priorities that apply to LEA budgets and SEA allocations.

LEA Budgets

An LEA's proposed budget should cover a three-year period and should take into account the following:

1. The number of Tier I and Tier II schools that the LEA commits to serve and the intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) selected for each school.
2. The budget request for each Tier I and Tier II school must be of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years. First-year budgets may be higher than in subsequent years due to one-time start-up costs.
3. The portion of school closure costs covered with school improvement funds may be significantly lower than the amount required for the other models and would typically cover only one year.
4. The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.
5. The number of Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve, if any, and the services or benefits the LEA plans to provide to these schools over the three-year grant period.
6. The maximum funding available to the LEA each year is determined by multiplying the total number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA is approved to serve by \$2 million (the maximum amount that an SEA may award to an LEA for each participating school).

SEA Allocations to LEAs

An SEA must allocate the LEA share of school improvement funds (*i.e.*, 95 percent of the SEA's allocation from the Department) in accordance with the following requirements:

1. The SEA must give priority to LEAs that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.
2. An SEA may not award funds to any LEA for Tier III schools unless and until the SEA has awarded funds to serve all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
3. An LEA with one or more Tier I schools may not receive funds to serve only its Tier III schools.
4. In making awards consistent with these requirements, an SEA must take into account LEA capacity to implement the selected school interventions, and also may take into account other factors, such as the number of schools served in each tier and the overall quality of LEA applications.
5. An SEA that does not have sufficient school improvement funds to allow each LEA with a Tier I or Tier II school to implement fully the selected intervention models may take into account the distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools among such LEAs in the State to ensure that Tier I and Tier II schools throughout the State can be served.
6. Consistent with the final requirements, an SEA may award an LEA less funding than it requests. For example, an SEA that does not have sufficient funds to serve fully all of its Tier I and Tier II schools may approve an LEA's application with respect to only a portion of the LEA's Tier I or Tier II schools to enable the SEA to award school improvement funds to Tier I and Tier II schools across the State. Similarly, an SEA may award an LEA funds sufficient to serve only a portion of the Tier III schools the LEA requests to serve.
7. Note that the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG requirements, under which an SEA that does not serve all of its Tier I schools must carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation to the following year, does not apply to FY 2010 SIG funds.

An SEA's School Improvement Grant award to an LEA must:

1. Include not less than \$50,000 or more than \$2 million per year for each participating school (*i.e.*, the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve and that the SEA approves the LEA to serve).
2. Provide sufficient school improvement funds to implement fully and effectively one of the four intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school the SEA approves the LEA

to serve or close, as well as sufficient funds for serving participating Tier III schools. An SEA may reduce an LEA's requested budget by any amounts proposed for interventions in one or more schools that the SEA does not approve the LEA to serve (*i.e.*, because the LEA does not have the capacity to serve the school or because the SEA is approving only a portion of Tier I and Tier II schools in certain LEAs in order to serve Tier I and Tier II schools across the State). An SEA also may reduce award amounts if it determines that an LEA can implement its planned interventions with less than the amount of funding requested in its budget.

3. Consistent with the priority in the final requirements, provide funds for Tier III schools only if the SEA has already awarded funds for all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
4. Include any requested funds for LEA-level activities that support implementation of the school intervention models.
5. Apportion any FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds so as to provide funding to LEAs over three years (assuming the SEA has requested and received a waiver to extend the period of availability to September 30, 2014).
6. Use FY 2010 school improvement funds to make the first year of three-year grant awards to LEAs (unless the SEA has received a waiver of the period of availability for its FY 2010 funds). Continuation awards for years 2 and 3 would come from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years.

APPENDIX B

	Schools an SEA MUST identify in each tier	Newly eligible schools an SEA MAY identify in each tier
Tier I	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(1) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” [‡]	Title I eligible [§] elementary schools that are no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(1)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier II	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(2) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”	Title I eligible secondary schools that are (1) no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(2)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or (2) high schools that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier III	Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I. ^{**}	Title I eligible schools that do not meet the requirements to be in Tier I or Tier II <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> have not made AYP for two years.

[‡] “Persistently lowest-achieving schools” means, as determined by the State--

(a)(1) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that--

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and

(2) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that--

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

[§] For the purposes of schools that may be added to Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III, “Title I eligible” schools may be schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds or schools that are Title I participating (i.e., schools that are eligible for and do receive Title I, Part A funds).

^{**} Certain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II rather than Tier III. In particular, certain Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II if an SEA receives a waiver to include them in the pool of schools from which Tier II schools are selected or if they meet the criteria in section I.A.1(b)(ii)(A)(2) and (B) and an SEA chooses to include them in Tier II.

Attachments

Attachment I - Definition of PLA Business Rules

Attachment II - Required Tables of Tier I, II, III Schools

Attachment III - LEA/School Building Application

Attachment IV - LEA Application Rubrics

Attachment V - Description of Statewide System of Support (SSOS)

Attachment VI - External Provider Application and Rubric

Attachment VII - Partnership Agreement

Attachment VIII –

- Attachment VIII-A: LEA Comment Request
- Attachment VIII-B: LEA Comments
- Attachment VIII-C: Public Comment Request
- Attachment VIII-D: Public Comments

School Ranking Business Rules

Short Narrative Version

Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools for MCL 380.1280c, SFSFII and SIG Applications

To identify the persistently lowest performing schools the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) first identified the pool of eligible schools. All Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring were identified and listed. All non-Title I secondary schools that were eligible to receive Title I funds were listed. Secondary schools in Michigan are those schools with any grades 7-12. Closed schools were removed from both lists. Schools were then rank ordered using the business rules below to find the lowest 5% of each and identify schools eligible for SIG funds as Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 schools. Tier 1 and 2 schools are placed under the supervision of the State Reform/Redesign Officer in accordance with MCL 280.1280c.

The following business rules were used to create the list of lowest performing 5% of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action and restructuring. These schools are eligible for SIG funds as Tier 1 schools:

- Schools were included if they receive Title I funds AND are identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. This resulted in a pool of 112 schools.
- Shared educational entities (SEE) with test scores to be sent back to the resident district were not included.
- The rules for school rankings described below were applied to the 112 school.
- The lowest 5% of the ranked schools are identified as Tier 1 schools.
- Any high schools in the Tier 1 pool that have a four-year graduation rate of 60% or less for the last three years are also identified as Tier 1 schools.

The following business rules were used to create the list of lowest performing 5% of secondary schools that are eligible to receive Title I funds but are not receiving Title I funds. These schools are eligible for SIG funds as Tier 2 schools.

- Schools were included if they were secondary schools (those housing any of grades 7-12) AND were eligible to receive Title I funds but did not receive Title I funds. This resulted in a pool of 559 schools.

- Shared educational entities (SEE) with test scores to be sent back to the resident district were not included.
- The rules for school rankings described below were applied to the 559 schools.
- The lowest 5% of the ranked schools are identified as preliminary Tier 2 schools.
- Secondary schools from the Tier 1 pool (Title I secondary schools that have not made AYP for two or more consecutive years) that did not fall into the lowest 5% but that have academic performance equal to or lower than the highest ranked preliminary Tier 2 school are added into the Tier 2 schools list.*
- Any high schools in the Tier 2 pool that have a four-year graduation rate of 60% or less for the last three years are also identified as Tier 2 schools.

The following business rules were used to create the list of Tier 3 schools. These schools are eligible for SIG funds as Tier 3 schools.

- All schools from the Tier 1 pool of schools that were not identified as Tier 1 lowest 5% or as Tier 1 based on graduation rate are included as Tier 3 schools unless the schools were newly eligible and identified as Tier 2 schools.
- Any school that was omitted due to small size (fewer than 30 FAY students tested), but shows up on Tier 1 or Tier 2 on a rerun of the list without the 30 FAY students tested restriction.

The following business rules were used to calculate the school rankings for the Tier 1 and Tier 2 lists.

- Proficiency calculations for the “all students group” are based on regular and alternate assessments: MEAP, MEAP-Access (if available), MME, MME-Access, and MI-Access.
- All students with valid math and reading scores in the assessments were included.
- A student with a performance level of 1 or 2 is considered proficient.
- All students with test scores who are full academic year (FAY) were included.
- Only public school students were included (no home schooled or private school students).
- The school receives a ranking if at least 30 FAY students are tested in either the elementary/middle school span or the high school span (or both) for each year.
- Schools were rank ordered using a proficiency index (based on the weighted average of two years of achievement data) and a progress index (based on three years of achievement data) to combine test scores from different grades, progress over two or three years, and test scores for both reading and mathematics.

- Achievement is weighted twice as much as improvement. This is because the focus is on persistently low-achieving schools. Weighting proficiency more heavily assures that the lowest performing schools, unless they are improving significantly over time, still receive the assistance and monitoring they need to begin improvement and/or increase their improvement to a degree that will reasonably quickly lead to adequate achievement levels.

* Although Michigan applied for a waiver to include Title I secondary schools in the Tier 2 pool, Michigan has chosen instead to use the flexibility granted to states through the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010 to make newly eligible all Title I secondary schools with lower performance than the highest performing Tier 2 school. This allows us to offer School Improvement Grant funds to an additional 64 schools. This additional flexibility is described in Guidance on School Improvement Grants, page 11: an SEA may identify as a Tier II school a secondary school that is eligible for Title I, Part A funds and that:

(A)(1) Has not made AYP for at least two consecutive years; or

(2) Is in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State's assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and

(B)(1) Is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA under paragraph (a)(2)(i) of the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (step 14 in A-18); or

(2) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

School Ranking Business Rules

Full Narrative Version

Datasets to be included (if available)

- Most recent two years of published data from fall MEAP, grades 03-08
- Most recent two years of published data from fall MEAP-Access, grades 03-08
- Most recent two years of published data from fall MI-Access, grades 03-08
- Most recent three years of published data from spring MME, grade 11
- Most recent three years of published data from spring MME-Access, grade 11
- Most recent three years of published data from spring MI-Access, grade 11

Subjects to be included (if available)

- Reading
 - English Language Arts is used in place of reading where English Language Arts is tested in all grades of a program (e.g., MEAP, MEAP-Access, MI-Access, MME, MME-Access, and MI-Access)
- Mathematics

Inclusion rules

- Include only scores from students who are full academic year (FAY)
- Include fall scores in data for the previous year's school and previous grade using feeder codes
- Include spring scores for the current year's school and grade
- Calculate ranking for a school on a subject only if at least 30 FAY students were tested in the elementary/middle school span (3-8) **or** the high school span (9-12), **or** both, for the most recent two years
- Include only public school students (no home schooled or private school students)
- Include schools only if they have ranks in both reading/ELA and mathematics
- Include schools only if they are not shared educational entities (SEEs) whose scores are returned to the sending districts for accountability purposes

Definitions

- Elementary/middle school = a school housing any of grades K-8
- High school = a school housing any of grades 9-12
- Secondary school = a school housing any of grades 7-12
- Full academic year (FAY) indicates that the student was claimed by the school on the previous two count days

Conventions

- A school classified as both elementary/middle and high school has ranks calculated for both sets of grades
- All calculations are rounded to the nearest 0.0001 (4th decimal place)
- The definitive version is based on mathematical operations as performed by Microsoft SQL.

Steps in Calculations

1. Repeat steps 2-5 separately for reading and mathematics and each grade range (elementary/middle versus high school) for each school with 30 or more FAY students tested the grade and subject in the most recent two years for which data are available
2. Calculate a percent proficiency index for the most recent two years in which data are available:
 - a. Obtain the percent proficient ($pp3$ and $pp2$ for the most recent and previous year, respectively)
 - b. Obtain the number of students tested ($nt3$ and $nt2$ for the most recent and previous year, respectively)
 - c. Calculate a weighted average of percent proficient over the most recent to years as $pp = ((pp3 * nt3) + (pp2 * nt2)) / (nt3 + nt2)$
 - d. Calculate the percent proficient index $ppi = (pp - \text{mean}(pp)) / \text{sd}(pp)$ [a z-score]
3. Calculate a percent change index:
 - a. Where adjacent year testing occurs (e.g., reading & math in elementary/middle school):
 - i. Obtain the percent of students improving or significantly improving for the two most recent years ($pi3$ and $pi2$ for the most recent and previous year, respectively)
 - ii. Obtain the percent of student declining or significantly declining for the two most recent years ($pd3$ and $pd2$ for the most recent and previous year, respectively)
 - iii. Calculate a weighted average of percents improving and declining as $pi = ((pi3 * nt3) + (pi2 * nt2)) / (nt3 + nt2)$ and $pd = ((pd3 * nt3) + (pd2 * nt2)) / (nt3 + nt2)$
 - iv. Calculate the two-year average percent improving minus two-year average percent declining ($pid = pi - pd$)
 - v. Calculate the percent change index $pci = (pid - \text{mean}(pid)) / \text{sd}(pid)$ [a z-score]
 - b. Where adjacent grade testing does not occur (e.g., high school):
 - i. Obtain the percent proficient two years ago ($pp1$) and if available three years ago ($pp0$)
 - ii. Obtain the number of FAY students tested two years ago ($nt1$) and if available three years ago ($nt0$)
 - iii. Calculate the slope ($b1$) of the simple regression of percents proficient on year (representing the three-year or four-year annual change in percent proficient) if there are at least 20 FAY students tested in each of the years used for calculating slopes. Assign a zero (0) if there are less than 20 FAY students tested in any one of the years used to calculate slopes.
 - iv. Calculate the percent change index $pci = (b1 - \text{mean}(b1)) / \text{sd}(b1)$ [a z-score]

4. Calculate the percent proficient plus change index ($ppci = [2*ppi + pci]/3$)
5. Calculate the school percentile rank on $ppci$ (pr)
6. Calculate the average school percentile rank across reading and mathematics and grade spans (elementary/middle versus high school) in which the school received a percentile rank ($pr.av.mr$ is calculated as the average of from 2 to 4 percentile ranks)
7. Calculate the school overall percentile rank across reading and mathematics ($pr.mr$) as the school percentile rank on $pr.av.mr$

NOTE: $\text{mean}(x)$ denotes the mean (or average) of x

NOTE: $\text{sd}(x)$ denotes the standard deviation of x

NOTE: Calculating separately for each grade span addresses the issues of differences in pass rates across subjects and across elementary/middle schools versus high schools. This assures that the list does not consist solely of high schools because of relatively more rigorous performance expectations in high school as compared to elementary/middle schools. Calculating separately for each grade span also assures that schools that teach students in both grade ranges (3-8 and high school) have measures that are comparable to all other schools.

NOTE: Using z-scores weights the proficiency and improvement portions of the calculations in the desired proportions, weights all subjects evenly, and weights elementary school and high school performance evenly.

Additional steps/criteria for Tier 1 lowest 5% and state watch lists**

1. Obtain for each school the following:
 - a. Whether the school receives Title I funds. Title I eligibility is derived from N129 CCD Schools (I.D. #22 - Title I School Status) file submission of previous school year.
 - b. Whether the school is under corrective action, restructuring, or improvement (CARI) under ESEA because of not making AYP for the most recent two years for which data are available
2. Limit the pool of schools upon which calculations are based to those that:
 - a. Receive Title I funds AND are under CARI
3. Identify schools in the lowest 5% of the eligible pool ($pr.mr \leq 5$) and schools in the eligible pool that are high schools with a graduation rate of 60% or lower for the last three consecutive year as on the Tier 1 lowest 5% list
4. Identify schools in the next lowest 15% of the eligible pool ($pr.mr > 5$ and $pr.mr \leq 20$) as on the state's Tier 1 watch list, if they do not show up on the Tier 2 list (described below)

Additional steps/criteria for Tier 2 lowest 5% and state watch lists**

1. Obtain for each school the following:
 - a. Whether the school is a secondary school
 - b. Whether the school has a graduation rate less than 60 for the most recent three years for which data are available (low grad rate)
 - c. Whether the school is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds (Title I eligible)
2. Limit the pool of schools upon which calculations are based to those that:
 - a. Are secondary schools AND are Title I eligible AND are not on the Tier 1 lowest 5% list
 - b. OR are secondary schools AND have a low graduation rate AND are not on the Tier 1 lowest 5% list
3. Identify schools in the lowest 5% of the eligible pool ($pr.mr \leq 5$) or schools with a graduation rate of less than 60 for the most recent three years for which data are available as on the preliminary Tier 2 lowest 5% list
4. Identify schools in the next lowest 15% of the eligible pool ($pr.mr > 5$ and $pr.mr \leq 20$) as on the preliminary Tier 2 watch list
5. Obtain the percentile rank of the highest ranked school on the Tier 2 lowest 5% list
6. Obtain the percentile rank of the highest ranked school on the state's Tier 2 watch list
7. Place on the final Tier 2 lowest 5% list:
 - a. all schools on the preliminary Tier 2 lowest 5% list
 - b. PLUS any schools from the Tier 1 pool that:
 - i. are secondary schools
 - ii. AND did not make it onto the Tier 1 lowest 5% list
 - iii. AND have overall performance (on $pr.mr$ calculated for all schools statewide) that is lower than or equal to the highest ranked school (on $pr.mr$ as calculated only for the Tier 2 eligible pool) that appears on the preliminary Tier 2 lowest 5% list
 - c. High schools with a graduation rate of 60% or below for three years
8. Place on the final Tier 2 watch list:
 - a. all schools on the preliminary Tier 2 watch list that do not show up on the Tier 2 list
 - b. PLUS any schools from the Tier 1 pool that:
 - i. are secondary schools
 - ii. AND did not make it onto the Tier 1 lowest 5% list
 - iii. AND did not make it onto the Tier 1 watch list
 - iv. AND have overall performance (on $pr.mr$ calculated for all schools statewide) that is lower than or equal to the highest ranked school (on $pr.mr$ as calculated only for the Tier 2 eligible pool) that appears on the preliminary Tier 2 watch list

Additional steps for the overall lowest 5% list (schools subject to state reform officer monitoring and/or takeover) and overall watch list (schools in danger of falling onto the lowest 5% list)

1. Place schools onto the overall lowest 5% list if they are on either the Tier 1 or Tier 2 lowest 5% list
2. Place schools onto the overall watch list if they are on either the Tier 1 or Tier 2 watch list

Additional steps/criteria for the small school lowest 5% projection list

1. Rerun the entire Tier 1/Tier 2 process as a projection without the $FAY \geq 30$ restriction (replaced by a $FAY \geq 1$ restriction), and identify schools as on the small schools lowest 5% projection list if:
 - a. They were not included in the original run
 - b. AND they appear on either the projected Tier 1 lowest 5% list or projected Tier 2 lowest 5% list

Additional steps for the Tier 3 list

1. Place schools on the Tier 3 list if they are in the Tier 1 pool, but do not show up on the overall lowest 5% list
2. Place schools on the Tier 3 list if they show up on the small school lowest 5% projection list but did not show up on the Tier 1 or Tier 2 lists in the initial run.

** Note: In addition to publishing the list of persistently lowest achieving schools (PLA) the Michigan Department of Education will publish a state watch list of schools in the lowest quintile (6-20%). This does not affect the PLA ranking or eligibility for the School Improvement Grant, but provides an alert to LEAs to work with these schools to keep them out of the PLA category.

Attachment II

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS							
District Name	LEA NCES#	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
Adrian City School District	2601950	Adrian High School	03927		X		
Buchanan Community Schools	2607140	Buchanan High School	04308		X		
Buena Vista School District	2607230	Buena Vista High School	04314		X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Farwell Middle School	04710		X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Lessenger Elementary-Middle School	04761	X			
Detroit City School District	2612000	Nolan Elementary School	04800		X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Phoenix Elementary	04862	X			
Detroit City School District	2612000	Southwestern High School	04831	X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	White Elementary School	04858		X		
Fitzgerald Public Schools	2614460	Fitzgerald Senior High School	05082		X		
Godfrey-Lee Public Schools	2616080	Lee High School	05260		X		
Grand Rapids Public Schools	2616440	Alger Middle School	01822		X		
Grand Rapids Public Schools	2616440	Gerald R. Ford Middle School	01823		X		
Grand Rapids Public Schools	2616440	Ottawa Hills High School	05338		X		
Grand Rapids Public Schools	2616440	Union High School	05350		X		
Grand Rapids Public Schools	2616440	Westwood Middle School	05354		X		
Grant Public School District	2616500	Grant High School	05387		X		
Mt. Clemens Community School District	2624690	Mount Clemens High School	06118		X		
Mt. Morris Consolidated Schools	2624720	E.A. Johnson Memorial H.S.	06128		X		
Oak Park City School District	2626190	Oak Park High School	06271		X		
Romulus Community Schools	2630120	Romulus Middle School	06610		X		
Saginaw City School District	2630390	Arthur Hill High School	06656		X		
Saginaw City School District	2630390	Thompson Middle School	06679		X		
School District of the City of Inkster	2619140	Inkster High School	05596		X		
Springport Public Schools	2632610	Springport High School	06808		X		
Van Dyke Public Schools	2634680	Lincoln High School	07048		X		
Waldron Area Schools	2635040	Waldron Middle School	01345		X		
Weston Preparatory Academy	2600230	Weston Preparatory Academy	01200		X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS

District Name	Lea NCES #	Building Name	School NCES #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate	Newly Eligible
Aisha Shule/WEB Dubois Prep. Academy School	2600124	Aisha Shule/WEB Dubois Prep. Academy School	00774		X			X
Albion Public Schools	2602070	Albion High School	03954		X			X
Allegan Public Schools	2602220	Allegan Alternative High School	03030			X		
Allen Park Public Schools	2602520	Allen Park Community School	82020			X		
Alma Public Schools	2602640	Alma Adult/Alternative Education	29010			X		
Alpena Public Schools	2602730	OxBow ACES Academy/Alternative and Adult Ed	04010			X		
Ann Arbor Public Schools	2602820	Stone High School	81010			X		
Baldwin Community Schools	2603810	Baldwin Senior High School	43040			X		
Bangor Public Schools	2603870	Bangor High School	80020			X		
Battle Creek Area Learning Center	2600275	Battle Creek Area Learning Center	13904			X		
Battle Creek Public Schools	2600005	South Hill Academy	13020			X		
Bay City School District	2604260	Wenona Center Home of Wenona High/Middle School	09010			X		
Beecher Community School District	2604500	Beecher High School	04133		X			X
Benton Harbor Area Schools	2604830	Benton Harbor High School	04162		X			
Bloomington Public School District	2606270	Bloomington High School	04247		X			
Cadillac Area Public Schools	2607590	Cooley School	83010			X		
Camden-Frontier Schools	2607710	Camden-Frontier Middle School	00842		X			
Casa Richard Academy	2600123	Casa Richard Academy	82902			X		
Cassopolis Public Schools	2608430	Ross Beatty High School	04397		X			
Cedar Springs Public Schools	2608520	New Beginnings Alternative High School	41070			X		
Center for Literacy and Creativity	2600236	Center for Literacy and Creativity	82949			X		
Cesar Chavez Academy	2600139	Cesar Chavez High School	82918			X		
City of Harper Woods Schools	2617760	Harper Woods High School	05441		X			
Clarkston Community School	2609900	Clarkston Community	63190			X		

District		Education					
Clintondale Community Schools	2610080	Clintondale High School	04491		X		
Coldwater Community Schools	2610140	Franklin High School	12010			X	
Comstock Park Public Schools	2610620	North Kent High School	41080			X	
Conner Creek Academy East	2600210	Conner Creek Academy East-MI Collegiate High	01494		X		
Covenant House Life Skills Center Central	2600322	Covenant House Life Skills Center Central	82991			X	
Covenant House Life Skills Center East	2600321	Covenant House Life Skills Center East	82990			X	
Covenant House Life Skills Center West	2600320	Covenant House Life Skills Center West	82989			X	
Davison Community Schools	2611430	Davison Alternative Education	25140			X	
Detroit Academy of Arts and Sciences	2600174	Detroit Academy of Arts and Sciences	82929			X	
Detroit Academy of Arts and Sciences	2600174	Detroit Academy of Arts and Sciences High School	01707		X		X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Barbara Jordan Elementary	82010			X	
Detroit City School District	2612000	Beckham, William Academy	04902	X			
Detroit City School District	2612000	Bethune Academy	04724		X		X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Bow Elementary School	82010			X	
Detroit City School District	2612000	Brown, Ronald Academy	82010			X	
Detroit City School District	2612000	Bunche Elementary School	82010			X	
Detroit City School District	2612000	Burns Elementary School	04660		X		X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Burt Elementary School	82010			X	
Detroit City School District	2612000	Campbell Elementary School	82010			X	
Detroit City School District	2612000	Carleton Elementary School	82010			X	
Detroit City School District	2612000	Carstens Elementary School	82010			X	
Detroit City School District	2612000	Central High School	04670		X		X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Cody College Preparatory Upper School of Teaching and Learning	04680		X		X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Coffey Elementary/Middle School	04681		X		X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Cooley High School	04684		X		X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Crockett High School	00073		X		X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Davison Elementary School	82010			X	

Detroit City School District	2612000	Denby High School	04693		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Drew Middle School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Duffield Elementary School	04700		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Earhart Middle School	04639		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Edmonson Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Finney High School	04712		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Fisher Magnet Lower Academy	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Fitzgerald Elementary School	04713		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Fleming Elementary School	04714	X				
Detroit City School District	2612000	Ford High School	04734		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Gardner Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Glazer Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Harding Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Holcomb Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Holmes, A.L. Elementary School	04637		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Hutchinson Elementary School	04744		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Jamieson Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Jemison School of Choice	00031		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Kettering High School	04755		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	King High School	04703		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Law Elementary School	04773		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Loving Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Marshall, Thurgood Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Mason Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	McColl Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	McFarlane Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	McKenny Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Mumford High School	04793		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Murphy Elementary-Middle School	04795		X			X

Detroit City School District	2612000	Neinas Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Northwestern High School	04802		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Osborn Upper School of Global Communications and Culture	04805		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Parker Elementary School	04807		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Pershing High School	04813		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Priest Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Pulaski Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Rutherford Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Schulze Elementary School	04826		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Scott, Brenda Middle School	01676	X				
Detroit City School District	2612000	Southeastern High School	04830		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Stewart Elementary School	04889		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Taft Middle School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Thirkell Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Trix Elementary School	04846		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Turning Point Academy	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Van Zile Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Vetal Elementary School	00281		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Wayne Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Western International High School	04857		X			X
Detroit City School District	2612000	Wilkins Elementary School	82010			X		
Detroit City School District	2612000	Young, Coleman A. Elementary	82010			X		
Detroit Community Schools	2600170	Detroit Community Schools- High School	01039		X			X
Detroit Midtown Academy	2600259	Detroit Midtown Academy	82964			X		
Detroit Service Learning Academy	2600239	Detroit Service Learning Academy	82953			X		
East Detroit Public Schools	2612450	Kellwood School (Alternative)	50020			X		
East Jordan Public Schools	2612560	East Jordan Elementary School	15060			X		
Ecorse Public School District	2612930	Ecorse Community High School	82250			X		
Evart Public Schools	2613560	Evart Alternative High	67020			X		

		School						
Ferndale Public Schools	2614280	University High School	01901		X			
Fitzgerald Public Schools	2614460	Neigebaur Alternative Education Center	50090			X		
Flint City School District	2614520	Northern High School	05141		X			X
Flint City School District	2614520	Northwestern High School	05114		X			X
Flint City School District	2614520	Schools of Choice	25010			X		
Francis Reh PSA	2600218	Francis Reh PSA	73909			X		
Galien Township School District	2615480	Galien Alternative Education School	11160			X		
George Washington Carver Academy	2600249	George Washington Carver Academy	82963			X		
Gibraltar School District	2615870	Downriver High School	82290			X		
Godfrey-Lee Public Schools	2616080	Vision Quest Alternative H.S.	41120			X		
Grand Haven Area Public Schools	2616380	Central High School	70010			X		
Grand Ledge Public Schools	2616410	Sawdon High School	23060			X		
Grand Rapids Public Schools	2616440	Adelante High School	41010			X		
Grand Rapids Public Schools	2616440	Park School	41010			X		
Hazel Park City School District	2618030	Hazel Park Breakfast Club	63130			X		
Hesperia Community Schools	2618270	Hesperia Community Education	62060			X		
Highland Park City Schools	2618330	Highland Park Community H.S.	05499		X			X
Holt Public Schools	2618480	Holt Central High School	33070			X		
Imlay City Community Schools	2619100	Venture High School	44060			X		
Jackson Public Schools	2619620	TA Wilson School	38170			X		
Jonesville Community Schools	2619920	Jonesville Alternative H.S.	30030			X		
Kalamazoo Public School District	2619950	Maple Street Magnet School for the Arts	05671		X			
Kalamazoo Public School District	2619950	Milwood Middle School	05665		X			
Kalamazoo Public School District	2619950	Phoenix Alternative High School	39010			X		
Kalkaska Public Schools	2620050	Northside Educational Center	40040			X		
Kelloggsville Public Schools	2620160	Discovery Alternative H.S.	41140			X		
Kensington Woods High School	2600099	Kensington Woods High School	47901			X		
Kent City Community Schools	2620310	Kent City High School	05708		X			

Kentwood Public Schools	2620340	Crossroads Alternative High School	41160			X		
Lake Shore Public Schools (Macomb)	2632670	North Lake High School	50120			X		
Lakeview Community Schools (Montcalm)	2620910	Lakeview High School	05764		X			
Lakeview Public Schools (Macomb)	2620880	Lakeview High School	50130			X		
LakeVille Community Schools	2620940	LakeVille Alternative High School	25280			X		
Lansing Public School District	2621150	Eastern High School	05792		X			X
Lansing Public School District	2621150	Education Options	33020			X		
Lansing Public School District	2621150	Riddle Elementary	33020			X		
Lapeer Community Schools	2621180	Lapeer Community High School	44010			X		
Life Skills Center of Pontiac	2600292	Life Skills Center of Pontiac	63920			X		
Lincoln Park Public Schools	2621600	Lincoln Park Middle School	01186		X			
Madison Public Schools (Oakland)	2622290	Edison Elementary School	63140			X		
Maple Valley Schools	2622620	Kellogg Education Center	23065			X		
Marion Public Schools	2622800	Marion High School	05976		X			
Marshall Public Schools	2622970	Shearman School EC Programs and Marshall AHS	13110			X		
Michigan Health Academy	2600138	Michigan Health Academy	00788		X			X
Monroe Public Schools	2624150	Orchard Center High School	58010			X		
Montrose Community Schools	2624420	Montrose Alternative Education Center	25260			X		
Mt. Pleasant City School District	2624750	Oasis Alternative Ed. School	37010			X		
Muskegon City School District	2624840	MCEC	61010			X		
Muskegon Heights School District	2624870	Muskegon Heights High School	06170	X				
Napoleon Community Schools	2624960	Ackerson Lake Community Education	38130			X		
New Haven Community Schools	2625230	New Haven High School	06184		X			
Niles Community School District	2625560	Cedar Lane School	11300			X		
Northview Public School District	2625950	Northview Alternative High School	41025			X		
Owosso Public Schools	2627210	Lincoln Alternative High School	78110			X		
Parchment School District	2627420	Barclay Hills Education Center	39130			X		

Paw Paw Public School District	2627660	Michigan Avenue Academy	80160			X		
Pickford Public Schools	2628020	Consolidated Community School Services	17090			X		
Pontiac Academy for Excellence	2600156	Pontiac Academy for Excellence - High School	00970		X			X
Pontiac City School District	2628740	Pontiac High School	06444	X				
Port Huron Area School District	2628830	Grant Educational Center	74010			X		
Portage Public Schools	2628950	Portage Community High School	39140			X		
River Rouge School District	2629760	Ann Visger K-5 Preparatory Academy	82120			X		
River Rouge School District	2629760	River Rouge Middle College High School Academy	06555		X			X
Roseville Community Schools	2630210	Eastland Middle School	06617		X			
Roseville Community Schools	2630210	Roseville Middle School	06627		X			
Ross Hill Academy	2600235	Ross/Hill Academy-Elementary	01205		X			X
Saginaw City School District	2630390	Ruben Daniels Middle School	06657		X			X
Saginaw City School District	2630390	Saginaw High School	06677		X			
Saginaw Learn to Earn Academy	2600318	Saginaw Learn to Earn Academy	73911			X		
School District of Ypsilanti	2636630	Ypsilanti High School	07290		X			
Shelby Public Schools	2631320	Oceana High School	64080			X		
Southfield Public School District	2632310	Southfield Regional Academic Campus	00666		X			
Southgate Community School District	2632340	Davidson Middle School	82405			X		
St. Johns Public Schools	2632820	Wilson Center	19140			X		
Swartz Creek Community Schools	2633420	Swartz Creek Academy	25180			X		
Taylor School District	2633540	John F. Kennedy High School	82150			X		
Taylor School District	2633540	Truman High School	06910		X			X
Traverse City Area Public Schools	2633870	Traverse City High School	28010			X		
Van Dyke Public Schools	2634680	Lincoln Middle School	07049		X			
Walled Lake Consolidated Schools	2635160	Walled Lake Community Education Center	63290			X		
Warren Woods Public Schools	2635220	Warren Woods Enterprise H.S.	50240			X		
Waverly Community Schools	2635520	Waverly Middle School	07164		X			

Western School District	2635940	Woodville Community Center	38010			X		
Westwood Community Schools	2611640	Robichaud Senior High School	04621		X			X
Westwood Heights Schools	2635970	Hamady Community High School	07205		X			X
Willow Run Community Schools	2636450	Willow Run High School	07235	X			X	
Windover High School	2600020	Windover High School	56901			X		
Wyoming Public Schools	2636570	Rogers High School	41026			X		
Yale Public Schools	2636600	Phoenix Alternative School	74130			X		

Attachment III

SIG GRANT--LEA Application

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS (SIG)

Legal Name of Applicant:	Applicant's Mailing Address:
LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant	
Name:	
Position and Office:	
Contact's Mailing Address:	
Telephone:	
Fax:	
Email address:	
LEA School Superintendent/Director (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Signature of the LEA School Superintendent/Director: X_____	Date:
LEA School LEA Board President (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Signature of the LEA Board President: X_____	Date:
The LEA, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

GRANT SUMMARY

Di District Name:
ISD/RESA Name:

District Code:
ISD Code:

FY 2010
School Improvement Grant – Section 1003(g)
District Proposal Abstract

For each of the models listed below, indicate the number of Schools within the District/LEA that will implement one of the four models: attach the full listing using form below in Section A , Schools to be Served, and the criteria for selection as attachments to this grant.

- ☐ **Close/Consolidate Model:** Closing the school and enrolling the students who attended the school in other, higher-performing schools in the district.
- ☐ **Transformation Model:** Develops teacher and leader effectiveness, implements comprehensive instructional programs using student achievement data, provides extended learning time and creates community-oriented schools.
- ☐ **Turnaround Model:** Replace principal and at least 50% of the staff, adopt new governance, and implement a new or revised instructional model. This model should incorporate interventions that take into account the recruitment, placement and development of staff to ensure they meet student needs; schedules that increase time for both students and staff; and appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services/supports.
- ☐ **Restart Model:** Close the school and restart it under the management of a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO) or an educational management organization (EMO). A restart school must admit, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

From the list of eligible schools (Attachment I), an LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school. Detailed descriptions of the requirements for each intervention are in Attachment II.

<u>SCHOOL NAME</u>	<u>NCES ID #</u>	<u>TIER I</u>	<u>TIER II</u>	<u>TIER III</u>	<u>INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)</u>			
					<u>turnaround</u>	<u>restart</u>	<u>closure</u>	<u>transformation</u>

Note: An LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant. LEA's are encouraged to refer to their Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and District Improvement Plan (DIP) to complete the following:

Provide a narrative description following each of the numbered items below for each school the LEA plans to serve with School Improvement Grant funds.

For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must:

1. Describe the process the LEA used to analyze the needs of the school and how the intervention was selected for each school.

The LEA must analyze the needs of each Tier I, II or III school using complete and consistent data. (The school building plan provides a possible model for that analysis. Do not attach a copy of the district or building CAN.)

2. Describe how the LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.

Note: If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.

If an LEA claims lack of sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must submit written notification along with the School Improvement Grant application, that it cannot serve all Tier I schools. The notification must be signed by the District Superintendent or Public School Academy Administrator and the President of the local school board. Notifications must include both signatures to be considered.

The notification must include the following:

- *A completed online Michigan District Comprehensive Needs Assessment indicating that the district was able to attain only a "Getting Started" or "Partially Implemented" rating (link below) in at least 15 of the 19 areas with a description of efforts to improve.*

- *Evidence that the district lacks personnel with the skills and knowledge to work with struggling schools. This includes a description of education levels and experience of all leadership positions as well as a listing of teachers who are teaching out of certification levels*
 - *A completed rubric (Attachment IV) scored by the Process Mentor team detailing specific areas of lack of capacity*
3. **For each Tier I and II school in this application, the LEA must describe actions taken, or those that will be taken, to:**
- a. Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements**
 - b. Select external providers from the state's list of preferred providers**
 - c. Align other resources with the interventions**
 - d. Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.**
 - e. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.**

4. **Include a timeline delineating the steps to be taken to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application.** *Include the action steps to be taken, who is responsible, start and end dates, and the metric to be used to determine completion. For example:*

Action step	Person Responsible	Start Date	End Date	Success Metric
Principal Interviews hired	S. Smith	July 1	July 20	New principal with turnaround experience

5. **Describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.**

6. **For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.**

7. **Describe the goals established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.**

8. **As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders (students, teachers, parents, community leaders, business leaders, etc.) regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools. Describe how this process was conducted within the LEA.**

C. BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve.

- The LEA must provide a budget (*see budget submission packet, beginning on the following page*) that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—
 - Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
 - Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
 - Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application.

Note: An LEA's budget must cover the period of availability, including any extension granted through a waiver, and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve.

An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000.

ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS STATE PROGRAMS

- **INSTRUCTIONS:** Please review the assurances and certification statements that are listed below. Sign and return this page with the completed application.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING FOR GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

No federal, appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of a federal agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any federal grant or cooperative agreement. If any funds other than federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member Of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form – LL*Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying*, in accordance with its instructions. The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the awards documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, INELIGIBILITY, AND VOLUNTARY EXCLUSION – LOWER TIER COVERED TRANSACTIONS

The prospective lower tier participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participating in this transaction by any Federal department or agency. Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal. **OG-4929**

Rev. 8/06
Grants Coordination and School Support
P.O. Box 30008, Lansing, Michigan 48909

Michigan Department of Education

--PAGE 1-

*Direct questions regarding this form to
(517) 373-1806.*

AUTHORITY:

COMPLETION: Voluntary. (Consideration for funding will not be possible if form is not filed.)

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT BUDGET

APPLICANT INFORMATION

TYPE OR PRINT:

APPLICANT	Legal Name of District		District Code
	Address of District		
	City and Zip Code		Name of County
CONTACT PERSON	Name of Contact Person		Telephone (Area Code) () -
	Address		City Zip Code
	E-Mail Address		Facsimile (A.C./No.) () -

GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED: \$_____

ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATION: By signing this assurances and certification statement, the applicant certifies that it will agree to perform all actions and support all intentions stated in the Assurances and Certifications on page 2, and will comply with all state and federal regulations and requirements pertaining to this program. The applicant certifies further that the information submitted on this application is true and correct.

	SUPERINTENDENT OR	
DATE _____	AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL _____	
		SIGNATURE
	TYPED NAME/TITLE _____	

ASSURANCE WITH SECTION 511 OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION APROPRIATION ACT OF 1990

When issuing statements, press releases, requests for proposals, solicitations, and other documents describing this project, the recipient shall state clearly: 1) the dollar amount of federal funds for the project, 2) the percentage of the total cost of the project that will be financed with federal funds, and 3) the percentage and dollar amount of the total cost of the project that will be financed by nongovernmental sources.

ASSURANCE CONCERNING MATERIALS DEVELOPED WITH FUNDS AWARDED UNDER THIS GRANT

The grantee assures that the following statement will be included on any publication or project materials developed with funds awarded under this program, including reports, films, brochures, and flyers: "These materials were developed under a grant awarded by the Michigan Department of Education."

CERTIFICATION REGARDING NONDISCRIMINATION UNDER FEDERALLY AND STATE ASSISTED PROGRAMS

The applicant hereby agrees that it will comply with all federal and Michigan laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination and, in accordance therewith, no person, on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, sex, marital status or handicap, shall be discriminated against, excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination in any program or activity for which it is responsible or for which it receives financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education or the Michigan Department of Education.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA EQUAL ACCESS ACT, 20 U.S.C.

7905, 34 CFR PART 108.

A State or subgrantee that is a covered entity as defined in Sec. 108.3 of this title shall comply with the nondiscrimination requirements of the Boy Scouts of America Equal Access Act, 20 U.S.C. 7905, 34 CFR part 108.

PARTICIPATION OF NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

The applicant assures that private nonprofit schools have been invited to participate in planning and implementing the activities of this application.

ASSURANCE REGARDING ACCESS TO RECORDS AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The applicant hereby assures that it will provide the pass-through entity, i.e., the Michigan Department of Education, and auditors with access to the records and financial statements as necessary for the pass-through entity to comply with Section 400 (d) (4) of the U.S. Department of Education Compliance Supplement for A-133.

ASSURANCE REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH GRANT PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

The grantee agrees to comply with all applicable requirements of all State statutes, Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, policies and award conditions governing this program. The grantee understands and agrees that if it materially fails to comply with the terms and conditions of the grant award, the Michigan Department of Education may withhold funds otherwise due to the grantee from this grant program, any other federal grant programs or the State School Aid Act of 1979 as amended, until the grantee comes into compliance or the matter has been adjudicated and the amount

disallowed has been recaptured (forfeited). The Department may withhold up to 100% of any payment based on a monitoring finding, audit finding or pending final report.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING TITLE II OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (A.D.A.), P.L. 101-336, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provides comprehensive civil rights protections for individuals with disabilities. Title II of the ADA covers programs, activities, and services of public entities. Title II requires that, "No qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by such entity." In accordance with Title II ADA provisions, the applicant has conducted a review of its employment and program/service delivery processes and has developed solutions to correcting barriers identified in the review.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING TITLE III OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (A.D.A.), P.L. 101-336, PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS AND COMMERCIAL FACILITIES

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provides comprehensive civil rights protections for individuals with disabilities. Title III of the ADA covers public accommodations (private entities that affect commerce, such as museums, libraries, private schools and day care centers) and only addresses existing facilities and readily achievable barrier removal. In accordance with Title III provisions, the applicant has taken the necessary action to ensure that individuals with a disability are provided full and equal access to the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations offered by the applicant. In addition, a Title III entity, upon receiving a grant from the Michigan Department of Education, is required to meet the higher standards (i.e., program accessibility standards) as set forth in Title III of the ADA for the program or service for which they receive a grant.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING GUN-FREE SCHOOLS - Federal Programs (Section 4141, Part A, Title IV, NCLB)

The applicant assures that it has in effect a policy requiring the expulsion from school for a period of not less than one year of any student who is determined to have brought a weapon to school under the jurisdiction of the agency except such policy may allow the chief administering officer of the agency to modify such expulsion requirements for student on a case-by-case basis. (The term "weapon" means a firearm as such term is defined in Section 92' of Title 18, United States Code.)

The district has adopted, or is in the process of adopting, a policy requiring referral to the criminal or juvenile justice system of any student who brings a firearm or weapon to a school served by the agency.

AUDIT REQUIREMENTS

All grant recipients who spend \$500,000 or more in federal funds from one or more sources are required to have an audit performed in compliance with the Single Audit Act (effective July 1, 2003).

Further, the applicant hereby assures that it will direct its auditors to provide the Michigan Department of Education access to their audit work papers to upon the request of the Michigan Department of Education.

IN ADDITION:

This project/program will not supplant nor duplicate an existing School Improvement Plan.

SPECIFIC PROGRAM ASSURANCES

The following provisions are understood by the recipients of the grants should it be awarded:

1. Grant award is approved and is not assignable to a third party without specific approval.
2. Funds shall be expended in conformity with the budget. Line item changes and other deviations from the budget as attached to this grant agreement must have prior approval from the Office of Education Innovation and Improvement unit of the Michigan Department of Education.
3. The Michigan Department of Education is not liable for any costs incurred by the grantee prior to the issuance of the grant award.
4. Payments made under the provision of this grant are subject to audit by the grantor.
5. This grant is to be used to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements.
6. The recipient must establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds.
7. If the recipient implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, it must include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements.
8. The recipient must report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

SIGNATURE OF SUPERINTENDENT OR AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL

Date

SIGNATURE OF LEA BOARD PRESIDENT

Date

SCHOOL BUILDING BUDGET

Districts and ISDs may apply for School Improvement grants for individual eligible school buildings within their jurisdiction for the purposes of this grant, eligible school buildings are those identified as a Tier I or Tier II school. Signature by the authorized representative indicates that the authorized representative of the school building will work cooperatively with the administrative and fiscal agent for this project. List the name of the school building for which you are applying below. **(Please use duplicate pages as necessary. A separate budget and budget detail narrative is required for each building. The budget must cover the three-year period of the grant. Year 1 must be separated into Pre-implementation activities and Implementation activities. See School Building application for example.)**

SCHOOL BUILDING

Legal Name of School Building	Building Code	Name and Title of Authorized Representative	
Mailing Address (Street)		Signature	
City	Zip Code	Telephone (Area Code/Local Number) () -	Date Signed (m/d/yyyy)
Name and Title of Contact Person		Mailing Address (If different from agency address)	

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT BUDGET APPROVAL FORM

INSTRUCTIONS: The Budget Summary and the Budget Detail must be prepared by or with the cooperation of the Business Office using the School District Accounting Manual (Bulletin 1022). *Please complete a 'School Improvement Grant Budget Approval Form' for EACH building. Duplicate 'School Improvement Grant Budget Approval Form' for each school.*

1. BUDGET SUMMARY FOR: Please Insert Building Name

LEGAL NAME OF APPLICANT:				District Code	
MDE USE ONLY	Grant No.	Project No.	Project Type	Ending Date	FY of Approved Activity 2010

BUDGET OBJECTS:

FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
110	Instruction -- Basic Programs							
120	Instruction -- Added Needs							
210	Pupil Support Services							
211	Truancy/Absenteeism Services							
212	Guidance Services							
213	Health Services							
214	Psychological Services							
216	Social Work Services							
220	Instructional Staff Services							
221	Improvement of Instruction							
225	Instruction Related Technology							
227	Academic Student Assessment							

230	General Administration							
232	Executive Administration							
240	School Administration							
250	Support Services Business							
257	Internal Services							
266	Operation and Maintenance							
280	Central Support Services							
281	Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation							
283	Staff/Personnel Services							
300	Community Services							
311	Community Services Direction							
331	Community Activities							
	SUBTOTAL							
	Indirect Costs _____ % Restricted Rate							
	TOTAL							

2. BUDGET DETAIL

Explain each line item that appears on the Budget Summary, using the indicated function code and title, on a plain sheet. ***(Provide attachment(s) as needed.)***

Date

BUSINESS OFFICE REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

Date

SUPERINTENDENT/DIRECTOR SIGNATURE

4. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

See the Assurances and Certifications section of the LEA Application for a complete list of assurances. LEA leadership signatures, including superintendent or director and board president, assure that the LEA will comply with all School Improvement Grant final requirements.

5. WAIVERS: The MDE has requested all of the following waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant. Please indicate which of the waivers the LEA intends to implement.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- ☐ Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

Note: Michigan has requested and received a waiver to extend the SIG grant funds through September 30, 2014.

- ☐ "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- ☐ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

SIG GRANT—School Building Application

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS (SIG)

Legal Name of School Building: School Building Code:	Mailing Address:
School Building Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Position and Office: Contact's Mailing Address: Telephone: Fax: Email address:	
LEA School Superintendent/Director (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Signature of the LEA School Superintendent/Director: X _____	Date:
LEA School LEA Board President (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Signature of the LEA Board President: X _____	Date:
Building Principal (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Signature of the Building Principal X _____	Date:
The LEA, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

Section A

1. Possible model to use for analysis of data.

The school should consider evidence of need by focusing on improvement status; reading and math achievement results, as measured by the MEAP, Mi-Access or the MME; poverty level; and the school's ability to leverage the resources currently available to the district. Refer to the school's Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) School Data and Process Profile Summary report. Do not attach the building CNA.

Consider how subgroups within the school are performing and possible areas to target for improvement. (The following charts contain information available in the school Data Profile and Analysis).

Sub Group Academic Data Analysis

Grade: Standards	Percent of Sub-group meeting State Proficiency					
	Reading			Mathematics		
Group	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year1	Year2	Year3
Social Economic Status (SES)						
Race/Ethnicity						
Students with Disabilities						
Limited English Proficient (LEP)						
Homeless						
Neglected & Delinquent						
Migrant						
Gender						
Male						
Female						
Aggregate Scores						
State						

Sub Group Non-Academic Analysis

Year:

Group	# Students	# of Absences		# of Suspension		# of Truancies	# of Expulsions	Unduplicated Counts	
		>10	<10	In*	Out*			In*	Out*
SES									
Race/Ethnicity									
Disabilities									
LEP									
Homeless									
Migrant									
Gender									
Male									
Female									
Totals									

Year:

Group	# of Students	# of Retentions	# of Dropouts	# promoted to next grade	Mobility	
					Entering	Leaving
SES						
Race/Ethnicity						
Disabilities						
LEP						
Homeless						
Migrant						
Gender						
Male						
Female						
Totals						

Enrollment and Graduation Data – All Students

Year:

Grade	# of Students	# Students enrolled in a Young 5's program	# Students in course/grade acceleration	Early HS graduation	# of Retentions	# of Dropout	# promoted to next grade
K							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							

Number of Students Enrolled in Extended Learning Opportunities

Year:

Number of Students in Building by grade	# Enrolled in Advanced Placement Classes	# Enrolled in International Baccalaureate Courses	# of Students in Dual Enrollment	# of Students in CTE/Vocational Classes	Number of Students who have approved/reviewed EDP on file
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					

2. School Building Capacity – Resource Profile

The following table lists the major grant related resources the State of Michigan manages and that schools may have as a resource to support their school improvement goals. As you develop your School Improvement Grant, consider how these resources (if available to your school) can be used to support allowable strategies/actions within the School Improvement Grant. Place a check in each box by the funding that will be used to support your SIG grant.

A full listing of all grants contained in No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is available at: www.mi.gov/schoolimprovement.

<input type="checkbox"/> General Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Title I Part A <input type="checkbox"/> Title I Schoolwide <input type="checkbox"/> Title I Part C <input type="checkbox"/> Title I Part D	<input type="checkbox"/> Title I School Improvement (ISI)	<input type="checkbox"/> Title II Part A <input type="checkbox"/> Title II Part D <input type="checkbox"/> USAC - Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Title III
<input type="checkbox"/> Title IV Part A <input type="checkbox"/> Title V Parts A-C	<input type="checkbox"/> Section 31 a <input type="checkbox"/> Section 32 e <input type="checkbox"/> Section 41	<input type="checkbox"/> Head Start <input type="checkbox"/> Even Start <input type="checkbox"/> Early Reading First	<input type="checkbox"/> Special Education
Other: (Examples include: Smaller Learning Communities, Magnet Schools.) A complete listing of all grants that are a part of NCLB is available at www.michigan.gov/schoolimprovement.			

3. School Building Commitment

Evidence of a strong commitment should be demonstrated through the district's and school's ability and willingness to support and implement the selected intervention for rapid improvement in student achievement and proposed use of scientific and evidence based research, collaboration, and parental involvement.

- a. Describe the school staff's involvement in and support of the school improvement application and their support of the proposed efforts to effect change in the school.
- b. Explain the district and school's ability to support systemic change required by the model selected.

4. School Improvement Intervention Plan—5 page limit

Describe in narrative form the building plan for implementing the intervention model selected.

5. External Provider Selection

Describe the process the building will use to select external providers or note that the school will select external providers from the MDE pre-approved list.

6. Alignment of Resources

Describe how the building's human and community resources will be aligned to facilitate implementation of the intervention selection.

7. Modification of local building policies or practices

Describe any local building policies or practices that will need to be modified to assure successful implementation of the intervention; such as an amendment to the collective bargaining agreement if needed.

8. Timeline

Include a comprehensive 3-year timeline for implementing the selected intervention. For year one, note which activities will occur during the pre-implementation phase of the grant; i.e. before the start of the 2011-2012 school year.

9. Annual Goals

Determine the school's student academic achievement goals in reading and mathematics **for each of the next three years** as determined by the state's assessments (MEAP/ MME/Mi-Access). For example, if the present proficiency rate in mathematics is 18%, what will it be at the end of year one of the grant, year two, and year three.

	Current Proficiency Rate	Goal for 2011-12	Goal for 2012-13	Goal for 2013-14
Reading				
Mathematics				

10. Stakeholder Involvement

Describe the LEA's process for identifying and involving stakeholders in the selection of the intervention model and the preparation of the application.

11. Sustaining Reforms

Describe how the reforms from the selected intervention will be sustained in this school after the funding period ends.

Section B.

Complete the attachment that describes the requirements and permissible activities for the chosen intervention.

Attachment A – Transformation

Attachment B – Turnaround

Attachment C – Restart

Attachment D - Closure

Section C.

Budget pages—A separate 1 and 3-year budget together with budget narrative must be submitted for each school. The budget for year 1 must be separated into the funding needed for the pre-implementation activities and implementation activities that begin with the school year 2011-12.

Example:

Year 1 Pre- Implem entation	Year 1 Implementation	Year 2	Year 3	Three- Year Total
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

Section D.

Baseline Data Requirements

Fill in the data requested. MDE is required to send this information to USDOED on a yearly basis.

USDOE Baseline Data Requirements

Provide the most current data (below) for each school to be served with the School Improvement Grant. These data elements will be collected annually for School Improvement Grant recipients.

Metric	
School Data	
Which intervention was selected (turnaround, restart, closure or transformation)	
Number of minutes in the school year	

Student Data	
Dropout rate	
Student attendance rate	
For High Schools: Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework for each category below	
Advanced Placement	
International Baccalaureate	
Early college/college credit	
Dual enrollment	
Number and percentage enrolled in college from most recent graduating class	
Student Connection/School Climate	
Number of disciplinary incidents	
Number of students involved in disciplinary incidents	
Number of truant students	
Teacher Data	
Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system	
Teacher Attendance Rate	

Fiscal Information

The MDE has asked for (and been granted) a waiver of section 421(b) of GEPA to extend the period of availability of the SIG funds. That waiver automatically applies to every LEA in the State seeking SIG funds. Accordingly, if an SEA is granted this waiver, an LEA must create a budget for the full period of availability of the funds, including the period granted by the waiver. Budgets must be submitted for school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014.

USES OF FUNDS

School Improvement Grant – Section 1003(g) funds must be used to supplement the level of funds that, in the absence of the Title I monies, would be made available from non-federal sources for the education of children participating in Title I programs. Therefore, **funds cannot supplant non-federal funds or be used to replace existing services.**

Improvement funds must be tracked separately from the Title I Basic Grant and the Section 1003(a) School Improvement Grant. Local fiscal agents are to place improvement funds in a Title I account assigned for school improvement. (This funding number must not be the same number as is used for the Title I Basic Grant award or Section 1003(a) School Improvement Grant.)

Intensive monitoring of grant implementation and evaluation are required and will begin in Fall 2011.

Since these are school improvement funds, districts may not combine funds into one account, and the amount awarded to each school must be spent on implementing one of the four turnaround models at the school.

The CFDA (Code of Federal Domestic Assistance) Number for this grant is #84.377A; 84.388A.

Attachment A--Transformation Model

The following items are required elements of the transformation model. Give a brief description after each requirement as to how it will be implemented.

1. Replace the principal
2. Include student data in teacher/leader evaluation
3. Evaluations that are designed with teacher/principal involvement
4. Remove leaders/staff that have not increased achievement
5. Provide on-going job embedded staff development
6. Implement financial incentives or career growth or flexible work conditions.
7. Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research based and aligned from one grade to the next as well as with state standards.
8. Promote continuous use of student data to inform instruction and meet individual needs of students.
9. Provide increased learning time
 - a. Extended learning time for all students in the core areas....
 - b. Instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education...
 - c. Teachers to collaborate, plan and engage in professional development...
10. Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement

11. Provide operational flexibility (staffing, calendars/time/budgeting) to implement comprehensive approach to substantially increase student achievement and increase graduation rates.
12. Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, SEA, or designated external leader partner or organization.

The following items are permissible elements of the transformation model. Provide a brief description after each element that will be implemented under the proposed building plan. (Leave blank those elements that are not being implemented.)

1. Provide additional \$ to attract and retain staff.
2. Institute a system for measuring changes in instructional practices that result from professional development.
3. Ensure that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of teacher and principal, regardless of seniority.
4. Conduct reviews to ensure that the curriculum is implemented with fidelity and is impacting student achievement.
5. Implement a school wide Response to Intervention model.
6. Provide PD to teachers/principals on strategies to support students in least restrictive environment and English language learners.
7. Use and integrate technology-based interventions.
8. Increase rigor through such programs as AP, IB, STEM, and others.
9. Provide summer transition programs or freshman academies

10. Increase graduation rates through credit recovery, smaller learning communities, and other strategies.
11. Establish early warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failure.
12. Partner with parents and other organizations to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs.
13. Extending or restructuring the school day to add time for strategies that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff.
14. Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline
15. Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.
16. Allow the school to be run under a new governance arrangement.
17. Implement a per pupil school based budget formula weighted based on student needs.

Attachment B—Turnaround Model

The following items are required elements of the turnaround model. Give a brief description after each requirement as to how it will be implemented.

1. Replace the principal
2. Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet student needs.
3. Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 per cent.
4. Select new staff.
5. Implement strategies such as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions.
6. Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job embedded PD aligned with instructional program and designed with school staff
7. Adopt a new governance structure. (May include turnaround office/turnaround leader who reports to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer.)
8. Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as with State academic standards.
9. Promote continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction to meet student needs.
10. Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time.

11. Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

The following items are permissible elements of the turnaround model. Provide a brief description after each element that will be implemented under the proposed building plan. (Leave blank those elements that are not being implemented.)

1. Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model
2. A new school model (themed, dual language academy, etc.)

Attachment C—Restart Model

The following items are required elements of the Restart model. Give a brief description after each requirement as to how it will be implemented.

1. A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization that has been selected through a rigorous review process.
2. A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

Attachment D—School Closure

The following items are required elements of the Restart model. Give brief description after each requirement as to how it will be implemented.

1. School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving.
2. The receiving schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

Attachment IV

Rubric for Scoring LEA Application

	Getting Started (1 point)	Partially Implemented (3 points)	Implemented (7 points)	Exemplary (10 points)
LEA Application— Question 1.				
Use of data analysis to select intervention model-- <u>The district articulates in their application that:</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They are in the process of establishing an assessment system that is aligned with student performance measures. ○ Disaggregated data is provided to the schools for their use in understanding student performance. ○ District provides a minimal description of the process and data they used to select the intervention for each school. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They have established a comprehensive assessment system, aligned with clearly defined performance measures. ○ They are in the process of implementing a district-wide framework for using disaggregated data that will be used to inform the choice of strategies to close the achievement gap. ○ District provides a description of the process and data available in their system that was used to select the intervention for each school. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They have established and are implementing a comprehensive assessment system that provides longitudinal and annual data. The data is aligned with clearly defined student performance measures, evaluated periodically and yields information which is reliable, valid and bias free. ○ They have implemented a system-wide framework for using disaggregated data to inform the choice of strategies designed to close the achievement gap. This system yields timely and accurate information that is meaningful and useful to district and school leaders and teachers in understanding student performance, district and school effectiveness. ○ District provides a description of the process and how they used data available in their system to select the intervention for each school. School leaders and teachers were involved in the process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They have established, and are implementing, a comprehensive assessment system, and providing longitudinal and current data, aligned with clearly defined student performance measures. The system is evaluated annually, and yields information which is reliable, valid and bias free. Prior to its establishment, a variety of stakeholders were involved in a dialog about the purpose, users and uses of the system. ○ They have implemented a system-wide framework for using multiple sources of disaggregated data to inform strategies to close the achievement gap. This system yields timely and accurate information that is meaningful and useful to district and school leaders, teachers and other stakeholders in understanding student performance, district and school effectiveness, and the impact of improvement efforts on student achievement. ○ District provides a

				description of the process and how they used data available in their system to select the intervention for each school. A clear rationale using the data is presented for using the plan selected. School leaders, teachers, and other stakeholders were involved in the decision-making process.
Question 2				
LEA capacity to use SI funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each identified school	○	○	○	○
Comprehensive needs assessment— <u>The District describes where it falls on the Comprehensive Needs Assessment</u>	○ Fewer than 15 of “the key characteristics are rated as “implemented” or “exemplary”. No plan is in place to address characteristics that need attention	○ 15 of the 19 key characteristics are rated as “implemented” or “exemplary”. A plan has been started to address the deficiencies, but no timelines or specific actions are included.	○ At least 17 of the 29 key characteristics are rated as “implemented” or “exemplary”. A plan is in place to address the 2 key characteristics that need attention.	○ All of the key characteristics described in the comprehensive need assessment are rated as “implemented” or “exemplary.”
Core District Function: Management and Operations— <u>District describes where it falls in the area of Management and Operations</u>	○ District has a lack of systemic processes in place that result in one or more of the following: Budget is in a deficit situation; No data systems are available to staff; buildings are in disrepair.	○ District has begun to put systemic processes in place such as: a fund equity of more than 2% of operating costs; data systems—some buildings have more access than others; teacher access to data systems is sporadic and little to no training is provided; some technology is available, but most classrooms have one computer dedicated to teacher use.	○ District has put systemic processes in place. Some challenges still exist. Budget is balanced, but payments may be late to creditors. Data systems are in place, but all staff cannot access student data as needed. Buildings are in good repair. Technology is in place for teacher use, but training is only for staff who are interested.	○ District has systemic processes in place. Budget is balanced and expenses are paid in a timely manner. Data systems are in place that provide rapid information to teachers to inform instruction. Teachers are highly trained in the use of technology. Buildings are in good repair
Core District Function: Teaching and Learning— <u>District describes where it falls in the area of</u>	○ The district does not have a written plan for supporting teaching and learning. ○ The curriculum is primarily based on the texts teachers are	○ The district has a written plan for supporting teaching and learning, but it is implemented based on the values and skills of individual building administrators. ○ There is some curriculum work underway at the building	○ The district has a written plan for supporting teaching and learning that is understood and implemented across the district. ○ Assessments are in place in some departments or at	○ The district provides, supports, and sustains teaching and learning through a written, systematic plan. ○ Curriculum is aligned to state standards. ○ District-wide and school level formative and summative

<u>Teaching and Learning</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> using and may be inconsistent across the district. Assessments common to the district consist solely of the state mandated tests. Professional development is at individual teacher request, with no common theme across staff and no accountability for follow up. No staff is available to support teaching with respect to curriculum alignment, data, evaluation, or content expertise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> level, but no mechanism is in place for district level curriculum discussions and decisions. Assessments have been written for some, but not all core content areas. Materials are purchased on a cycle, rather than being based on curriculum changes at the state level. Teachers attend PD based on bargaining agreements, rather than teacher or district pedagogy needs. PD is provided only by outside sources, with no classroom follow up. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> grade levels, but not in all subject areas. Materials are textbook based. Supplemental materials are not a part of the curriculum. PD is available only at the district level. Training and support is provided primarily by outside providers. Some follow up is done from the district level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> assessments are in place. Materials and technology needed for instruction are in place. New teachers have a strong induction process. PD is available both at the building and district levels. It is provided primarily by personnel within the district.
Contextual Capacity: Labor and Board Relations— <u>The District describes its present context</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is disagreement by either the Board of Education or the Professional Labor Organization regarding a systemic plan for improving student achievement in the district. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board of Education and the Professional Labor Organization have not reached agreement regarding a systemic plan for improving student achievement in the district. A plan is written but it focuses only at the school level. Accountability for results is not clearly established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board of Education and the Professional Labor Organization have not reached agreement regarding a systemic plan for improving student achievement in the district. A plan is written that focuses system-wide and is linked to needs at a broad level. No benchmarks for the plan are in place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is agreement by the Board of Education and the Professional Labor Organization regarding a systemic plan for improving student achievement in the district. Plan reflects a vision of rapid improvement Plan allows for the placement of resources into the schools most in need of improvement. Plan holds each entity accountable for results.
Contextual Capacity: Human Resources— <u>The District describes its present context</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No plan is in place to train, mentor, or retain new staff Teachers are assigned to classes by right of seniority, with lowest achieving classes assigned to the least experienced staff. Planning time not available for grade or content level teachers to collaborate Teacher absences 15% or greater on a daily basis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A plan is in place to train, mentor, and retain new staff An evaluation plan is in place for all staff, but some staff is evaluated inconsistently due to administrator's work load. Some planning time is available for grade or content level teachers to collaborate, but may be scheduled before or after school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A plan is in place to train, mentor, and retain both present and new staff An evaluation plan is in place for all staff. Provisions are made for assistance where improvements are needed. Some planning time is available for grade or content levels teachers to collaborate during the school day. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A systematic plan is in place to recruit, train, mentor, and retain both present and new staff An evaluation plan is in place for all staff. Provisions are made for assistance where improvements are needed. Planning time is available for grade or content level teachers to collaborate during the school day
Question 3a.				

Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal information is provided about the interventions the district selected and how they will be implemented. Some interventions appear to be inconsistent with the final grant requirements for the model selected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some information is provided about the interventions the district proposes to implement. Most of the proposed interventions are consistent with the final grant requirements for the model selected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete information is provided about the interventions the district proposes to implement. All proposed interventions are consistent with the final grant requirements for the model selected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive information is provided about the interventions the district proposes to implement. All proposed interventions are consistent with the final grant requirements for the model selected.
Question 3b.				
Selection of external partner(s) for intervention model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No work has been started to identify external partners to assist buildings in implementation of the intervention model selected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District is in the process of identifying external partners who would be able to assist the buildings with the implementation of the intervention model they selected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District created a list of possible external partners that would be available to assist buildings with implementing an intervention model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District is working with the school(s) to select external partners to assist with the intervention model selected
Question 3c.				
Align additional district resources with the interventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan does not address how resources in addition to SIG will be used to implement the intervention selected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan addresses how some resources in addition to SIG will be used to implement the intervention selected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan addresses how district will use resources in addition to SIG to implement the intervention selected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan illustrates how specific resources in addition to SIG will be used to implement specific components of the intervention selected
Question 3d				
Modify practices or policies to enable schools to implement the interventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan does not address whether district needs to modify practices and/or policies in order to implement the selected intervention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan states that district is looking at modifying some of its policies and/or practices to implement the selected intervention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan states that district has begun the work of modifying policies and/or practices to implement the selected intervention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan addresses all areas in which the district has modified policies and/or practices to implement the selected intervention.
Question 3e.				
Plan includes demonstration of capacity building and longer term sustainability for Tier I and II schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan does not demonstrate increased capacity building or longer term sustainability for Tier I and II schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan reflects increase in capacity building but does not reflect longer term sustainability for Tier I and II schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan reflects an increase in capacity building and longer term sustainability for Tier I and II schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan reflects an increase in capacity building and longer term sustainability for Tier I and II schools. Plan reflects a commitment to retaining effective leaders and staff in place beyond the life of the grant
Question 4				
Timeline delineating steps to implement selected model(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No timeline is presented for implementing the selected model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A broad timeline is presented in the plan, but does not contain details necessary for implementation. Persons accountable for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A detailed timeline is presented for the first year of the project. Persons accountable for activities are named. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A detailed timeline is presented for the first year of the project. Persons accountable for activities are named.

		grant activities are not named.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A broader timeline is presented for years 2 and 3 of the project with the understanding that a detailed timeline will be in place by the end of year 1.
Question 5				
Annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Annual goals for student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics on the state assessment are not shown in the plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Annual goals for student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics on the state assessment are shown for the first year of the grant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Annual goals for student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics on the state assessment are shown for the first two years of the grant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Annual goals for student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics on the state assessment are shown for all three years of the grant.
Question 6				
Services for Tier III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No response needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○
Question 7				
Goals for Tier III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No response needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○
Question 8				
LEA Consultation with relevant stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ District does not address how this consultation occurred. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ District did involve board members and building leaders as stakeholders in the process of preparing the LEA application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ District involved teachers, building leaders, board members in the process of preparing the LEA application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ District articulates how relevant stakeholders were consulted regarding the LEA application and the implementation of the selected model(s). ○ District involved a wide range of stakeholders such as students, teachers, parents, board members, community leaders, business leaders in the process.

Rubric for Scoring School Building Application

	Getting Started (1 point)	Partially Implemented (3 points)	Implemented (7 points)	Exemplary (10 points)
Section A	○	○	○	○
1. Subgroups, Enrollment, Graduation Data and Extended Learning Opportunities	○ No data is provided regarding students in the school.	○ Data is provided regarding student performance, etc., but little explanation is provided about targeted areas for improvement	○ Data is provided regarding student performance, etc. Target areas are identified for improvement.	○ Complete data is provided regarding student performance, etc. Target areas for improvement are identified together with supporting rationale.
2. School Resource Profile	○ No resources in addition to SIG are identified to assist in supporting the implementation of the selected intervention.	○ Some state and federal funds, in addition to SIG \$ have been identified to assist in funding the intervention selected.	○ State and Federal funds, in addition to SIG \$ have been identified to assist in funding the intervention selected.	○ A complete funding plan, including both state and federal resources, is presented to fund the intervention selected.
3a. Evidence of commitment of school teachers, leaders and others to the turnaround effort	○ No evidence exists	○ Meeting agendas were provided to show that the turnaround efforts were discussed	○ Evidence provided indicated that staff and building leaders support the turnaround effort	○ Evidence provided showed that the staff, leaders and other stakeholders support the turnaround model
3b. School's ability to support systemic change required by intervention selected	○ No evidence was presented that the school has the capacity to implement the intervention selected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ District provides general expectations about instructional practices, but does not offer support directly to the building. ○ District does not provide target expectations for student achievement on a yearly basis. ○ Staff evaluation is done, but not on a regular basis. ○ Principals are not evaluated based on student achievement. ○ Professional development is provided by the district, but not based on individual teachers' needs. ○ The schedule is not set so that time is available for teacher collaboration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The school principal and teachers provide input to the district about instructional practices to be implemented that are designed to improve student achievement. ○ Yearly expectations are set for student achievement and communicated to staff. ○ All certified staff are evaluated on a regular basis ○ Principals are held accountable by the district for student success in their buildings. ○ Some time for teacher collaboration is in place. ○ Job embedded professional development is just beginning in the building. ○ The staff has rigorous instructional practices for all students and is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Through a collaborative process that involves the district, the building principal and teachers, clear expectations about instructional practices designed to improve student achievement are set. ○ Yearly expectations are set for student achievement and communicated to staff, students, parents, and other stakeholders ○ All certified staff are evaluated on a regular basis and held accountable for student success. ○ Principals are held accountable by the district for student success in their buildings.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom rigor varies as the staff does not have a common understanding of what constitutes quality student work. School provided a minimal description of how they plan to use data and research to guide instruction for all students. School is working toward putting collaboration time in place for teachers either before or after school. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> working on a common understanding of what constitutes quality student work. School provided a description of how they are beginning to use data and research to guide instruction for all students and their plan for future work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time for teacher collaboration is in place. Job embedded professional development is an integral part of the principal's and teachers' days. The staff has rigorous instructional practices for all students and a common understanding of what constitutes quality student work. School provided a complete description of how they use data and research to guide instruction for all students.
4. Intervention Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School gives a minimal description of the activities they will focus on as a result of the SIG grant. Description does not contain rationale for why activities were selected or how they are expected to increase student achievement Minimal description of the pre-implementation activities in year one is provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School gives a description of the activities they will focus on as a result of the SIG grant. School provides a description of pre-implementation activities that will be completed in year one. All pre-implementation activities appear to be reasonable and necessary. Description contains rationale for why activities were selected and how they are expected to increase student achievement No information is provided about how the activities will be implemented and by whom School mentions that the SIG activities will be integrated into their School Improvement Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School gives a good description of the activities they will focus on as a result of the SIG grant. School provides a description of pre-implementation activities that will be completed in year one and makes the connection with the year one implementation plan. All pre-implementation activities appear to be reasonable and necessary and address the needs identified by the LEA. All pre-implementation activities appear to be related to the goal of improving student achievement. Description contains rationale for why activities were selected and how they are expected to increase student achievement Some information is provided about how the activities will be implemented and by whom School discusses how they will approach integrating the SIG activities into their School Improvement Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School gives detailed description of the activities they will focus on as a result of the SIG grant. School provides a detailed description of pre-implementation activities that will be completed in year one and makes the connection with the year one implementation plan All pre-implementation activities appear to be reasonable and necessary and address the needs identified by the LEA All pre-implementation activities appear to be related to the goal of improving student achievement. Description contains rationale for why activities were selected and how they are expected to increase student achievement Complete information is provided about how the activities will be implemented and by whom School discusses how they will approach integrating the SIG activities into their

				School Improvement Plan	
4. Intervention Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o School presents a minimal description of how they will use data to develop their plan and set goals based on needs. o No apparent plan is in place to collect, analyze, and share data with internal and external stakeholders. o No plan is presented as to how instruction will be adjusted based on progress. o State assessment is the only tool named that will be used to measure student progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o School presents a description of how data will be used to develop their plan and set goals based on needs. o School is working on a plan to collect, analyze, and share data with internal and external stakeholders, but it is in the beginning phases. o School is working on their plan to adjust instruction based on progress. o Some assessment tools, in addition to the state assessments are mentioned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o School presents a description of how they are using data to develop and refine plans and goals based on needs. o School has a plan for collecting, analyzing, and sharing data with internal stakeholders and has begun its implementation. o School is presently using some of its data to adjust instruction based on progress, but plans to do more o School is using several assessment tools in addition to the state assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o School presents a description of how they are using data to develop and refine plans and goals based on needs. o School collects, analyzes, and shares data with internal stakeholders o School is using its data to adjust instruction based on progress, and plans to do more o School is using several assessment tools in addition to the state assessments o School is using data to drive its decisions related to instruction and professional development 	
4. Intervention Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Oversight and administration for the project was not addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Position was listed o No job description was included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Position was included in the budget. o Partial job responsibilities were included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Position was listed in the budget. o Detailed job responsibilities for the position were included. 	
4. Intervention Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o School did not articulate any specific school improvement technical assistance or evaluation needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o School has begun to identify some specific needs they have with relation to school improvement and evaluation. o No personnel were named as coordinators of these efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o School has identified some specific needs they have with relation to school improvement and evaluation. o No one has been assigned to these duties on an ongoing basis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o School has identified the specific needs they have with relation to school improvement and evaluation. o Building or district staff have been named to coordinate these services. 	
5. Selection of external provider (s) for intervention model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No work has been started to identify external partners to assist the building in implementation of the intervention model selected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Some work has started to identify external providers who can assist with implementation of the model selected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Work has started to identify external providers who can assist with implementation of the model. o A process is being developed that will be used for final identification of providers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o External providers have been selected to provide assistance with implementation of the model selected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o
6. Align building's human and community resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Plan does not address how the building's human and community resources will be aligned to implement the intervention selected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Plan addresses how some of the building's human resources will be aligned to implement the intervention selected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Plan addresses how the building's human and community resources will be aligned to implement the intervention selected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Plan addresses how the building's human resources and community resources will be aligned to implement the intervention selected. o Plan identifies specific community resources that will be used in 	

				the selected intervention
7. Modification of local building policies or practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan does not address whether building needs to modify practices and/or policies in order to implement the selected intervention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan states that the building is looking at modifying some of its policies and/or practices to implement the selected intervention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan states that building has begun the work of modifying policies and/or practices to implement the selected intervention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan addresses all areas in which the building has modified policies and/or practices to implement the selected intervention.
8. Building timeline delineating steps to implement selected model(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No timeline is presented for implementing the selected model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A broad timeline is presented in the plan, but does not contain details necessary for implementation. Building personnel accountable for grant activities are not named. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A detailed timeline is presented for the first year of the project. Building personnel accountable for activities are named. Pre-implementation activities are noted for Year 1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A detailed timeline is presented for the first year of the project. Building Personnel accountable for activities are named. Pre-implementation activities are noted for Year 1. A broader timeline is presented for years 2 and 3 of the project with the understanding that a detailed timeline will be in place by the end of year 1.
9. School's academic record and goals in reading and mathematics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School did not provide their current academic record and goals for the next three years. 	School provided their current academic record but did not make projections for the next three years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School provided their current academic record, but made projections only for the upcoming year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School provided their current academic record and made projections for the upcoming three years.
10. School's collaborative efforts to include parents, community, and outside experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School does not have a time set aside for collaborative efforts with parents and community. School did not include stakeholders in the application process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School has sporadic collaborative efforts with parents and community, but nothing on a regular basis. School did not include stakeholders in the application process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School has an ongoing set of collaborative efforts where they engage with parents and the community on a regular basis. School included stakeholders in the application process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School has an ongoing set of collaborative efforts where they engage with parents and the community on a regular basis. Outside experts such as social workers, juvenile justice representatives, nutrition experts, etc. are invited to make presentations and answer questions Town Hall meetings are held to receive input from parents and community members. Data is collected via surveys to ascertain how school is progressing. School included stakeholders in the application process
11. Sustaining reforms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan does not describe how capacity will be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan describes capacity building, but not how it will be put into place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan describes capacity building, and how it will be put into place for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan reflects an increase in capacity building and longer

	increased and put into place within the building that will lead to longer term sustainability	for long term sustainability.	long term sustainability.	sustainability. ○ Plan reflects a commitment to retaining effective building leaders and staff in place beyond the life of the grant
--	---	-------------------------------	---------------------------	---

Section B--Rubric for Scoring Inclusion of Required Elements in Plan.

Plan addresses all required components of the intervention. 100 points

Plan does not address all required components of the intervention. 0 points

Rubric for Scoring LEA Budget to Support Implementation

	Getting Started (1 point)	Partially Implemented (3 points)	Implemented (7 points)	Exemplary (10 points)
Budget includes necessary personnel and activities to implement selected intervention model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No personnel and intervention activities were included in budget ○ Some budget items do not correlate with plan activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Budget included personnel and activities, but were not specific to the intervention efforts ○ Some budget items do not correlate with plan activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Budget included appropriate personnel and activities to support the intervention efforts ○ Budget items correlate with projected activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Budget included appropriate personnel and activities to support the intervention efforts ○ Position Description(s) and listing of activities were included ○ Budget items correlate with projected activities

Budget items/activities are reasonable, allowable, and necessary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Budget included non-allowable items/activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A majority of the budget items are reasonable, allowable, and necessary to support intervention activities. Some items are not allowable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All items contained in the budget are reasonable, allowable, and necessary to support intervention activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All items contained in the budget are reasonable, allowable, and necessary to support intervention activities ○ Budget indicate how the school will integrate all available state, local and federal resources to support the intervention efforts
Budget covers allowable timeline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Budget covers 3-yr period—no 1-year breakdown for 1st year provided. No budget narrative. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Budget covers 3-year request and includes 1st year breakdown into pre-implementation and implementation activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Budget covers 3-year request and includes 1st year breakdown into pre-implementation and implementation activities. ○ Budget remaining after pre-implementation activities is sufficient to fund the first year of the grant. ○ Complete budget narrative is provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Budget covers 3-year request and includes 1st year breakdown into pre-implementation and implementation activities. ○ Budget remaining after pre-implementation activities is sufficient to fund the first year of the grant. ○ Complete budget narrative is provided. ○ Fiscal monitoring plan is provided.
Budget includes all required elements of intervention model(s) selected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Budget provided does not reflect the elements of the selected intervention model(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Budget provided addresses 50% of the required elements of the selected intervention model(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Budget provided includes all elements of selected intervention model(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Budget provided includes all elements of selected intervention model(s) ○ Budget provided integrates elements of intervention model(s) with other local, state, and federal funded initiatives into a cohesive program

Rubric for Scoring Overall Plan

	10 points	20 points	30 points	40 points
Plan is clear and cohesive	<p>Application shows little evidence of planning for a cohesive approach that will lead to significant gains in student achievement. Staff has not been put in place to oversee grant activities. No plans are in place to sustain improvements after the end of the grant period.</p>	<p>Application shows some evidence of planning for a cohesive three-year effort that will lead to significant gains in student achievement. Reference is made as to how the grant will be managed, but staffing is not made explicit. No plans are in place to sustain improvements at the end of the grant period.</p>	<p>Application shows evidence of planning for a cohesive, three-year grant designed to lead to significant gains in student achievement. Planning appears to be complete for Year 1, but Years 2 & 3 are not well spelled out. Reference is made to staff that will oversee the grant. Minimal reference is made to the longer term plan to sustain improvements after the end of the grant period.</p>	<p>Application shows evidence of a well-thought out approach to improving student achievement over a three-year period. Cohesive activities are planned over the three year grant periods that are designed to lead to significant gains in student achievement. Appropriate staff is in place to oversee the grant activities. Plans are in place to sustain improvements after the end of the grant period.</p>

Attachment V

STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF SUPPORT

System of Support for Title 1 Schools identified for Improvement, Corrective Action or Restructuring

A significant element of Michigan's Statewide System of Support (SSOS) includes forming partnerships across the state. MDE is tapping into the resources of Intermediate School Districts (ISD) and professional organizations to contribute expertise, coordinate services, and to provide regional guidance to local districts with Title I High Priority Schools.

The SSOS focuses on capacity-building. The primary focal points for capacity-building at the school level are leadership and fidelity to a well-written school improvement plan. There are four major elements to this initiative: **Principal Fellowship; Leadership Coaches; Process Mentors; and the School Process Review.**

The Principal Fellowship and Leadership Coach Institute are conducted by Michigan State University (MSU) in the summer with follow-up throughout the school year. The focus of both the Fellowship and the Institute is to build the capacity of the building leader in alignment with the Leadership strand of Michigan's School Improvement Framework; our blueprint for all academic initiatives in the state (see www.michigan.gov/schoolimprovement).

The Principal Fellowship is a one to week residential study of leadership in relation to instruction. Visionary leadership, recognizing good instruction, and using data to direct education are the primary

themes of the Fellowship program. Principals in identified schools, along with their school improvement teams, are strongly encouraged to attend the summer session. Follow-up sessions occur at least quarterly to update principals and leadership teams and maintain the cohort as a learning community.

Leadership Coaches are also trained in a program developed by Michigan State University. Coaches are selected from groups of distinguished administrators and principals who were successful in high priority schools. Leadership coaches are specifically assigned to assist the principal to implement the themes of the Principal Fellowship and the School Improvement Leadership strand. They also assist the principal in developing a strong leadership team to drive and implement the building level school improvement plan. The coach does not direct the principal; rather, through a series of thoughtful questions and feedback, the principal reaches leadership plans/conclusions on his/her own. In this way, when the coaching experience is finished, the principal has the capacity to make those decisions independently. The coach is in the school approximately three days per week with the building principal. The coach is hired for a school by the regional ISD.

Leadership Coaches attend the Principal Fellowship with the principal and leadership team from their assigned schools. The result is a common vocabulary between the principal and coach, an understanding of the role of both the coach and the principal in the school, and a set of expectations for beginning the school year. More information about coaches and principal training is available at www.aypsupport.org.

The third element of the SSOS is the Process Mentor Team. This team builds capacity to examine building level data, use the data to make instructional decisions based on research-based designs, and

frequently assess whether instruction needs to be adjusted. The mentor team works with the principal, and the School Improvement Team. The mentor team visits the school a minimum of four times per year to refine the School Improvement Plan and short-term instructional and student learning goals. There are three major goals for these visits:

1. To hold schools accountable for results,
2. To remove barriers to improvement, and
3. To identify and provide resources for change.

Process Mentors are a team of two in schools identified for improvement, then a team of three in schools identified for corrective action or restructuring. The team is comprised of an ISD staff member familiar with the school improvement planning process, a central office staff member from the LEA, and, in corrective action and restructuring schools, a representative from MDE is added to the team. The team works together, but each plays a different role. The ISD person facilitates groups through the school improvement process and the use of data, and assists in setting meaningful goals. The role of the district person is to help remove systemic barriers that may impede the school's progress and to serve as a built-in communication link to the district central office. The MDE representative's role is to assist with compliance issues in corrective action and facilitate communication with MDE. All three mentors support the coordination and use of additional resources.

The School Process Review provides both MDE and the school's Process Mentor Teams with an independent picture of the newly identified schools in relationship to their progress on the School Improvement Framework. This review gives impartial information to MDE, the district and building regarding how a school is implementing the instructional core.

After the School Process Review is finished, there is a report of descriptive data provided to the Process Mentor Team, the School Improvement Team and MDE. The building then works with the

Process Mentor Team to determine next steps based on this data.
There is follow-up provided in late spring for a “data dig” to inform the building’s School Improvement Plan for the following year.

ATTACHMENT VI

SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

Applicants must respond to each question/item in each section of the application.
Incomplete applications will not be considered.



Electronic Application Process

Applicants are **required** to complete and submit the application,
including all required attachments to:

hatfieldt@michigan.gov

Applications will be received on an ongoing basis and will be reviewed in the

Applicants must respond to each question/item in each section of the application.
Incomplete applications will not be considered.

Michigan Department of Education

2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

Preferred External Educational Services Provider Application

Technical support will be available Monday – Friday, from 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

All information included in the application package must be accurate. All information that is submitted is subject to verification. All applications are subject to public inspection and/or photocopying.

Contact Information

All questions related to the preferred provider application process should be directed to:

Anne Hansen

Consultant

Office of Education Improvement & Innovation

OR

Tammy Hatfield

Consultant

Office of Education Improvement & Innovation

Telephone: (517) 373-8480 or (517) 335-4733

Email: hatfieldt@michigan.gov

Michigan Department of Education

2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

Preferred External Educational Services Provider Application

EXTERNAL PROVIDERS: BACKGROUND & APPROVAL PROCESS

Under the Final Requirements for School Improvements Grants, as defined under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, Title I, Part A. Section 1003(g) and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act as amended in January 2010, one of the criteria that the MDE (SEA) must consider when an LEA applies for a SIG grant is the extent to which the LEA has taken action to “recruit, screen, and select external providers...”. To assist LEA’s in this process, the MDE is requesting information/applications from entities wishing to be considered for placement on a preferred provider list that will be made available to LEA’s on the MDE website. If an LEA selects a provider that is not on the list, the provider will have to go through the application review process before engaging in the turnaround intervention at the LEA. Applications will be reviewed on their merits and not on a competitive basis. Please note that the application and accompanying attachments will be accessible online to LEA’s seeking to contract for educational services.

Preferred external providers will be required to participate in a state-run training program that specifies performance expectations and familiarizes providers with state legislation and regulations. External providers will be monitored and evaluated regularly and those who are not getting results will be removed from the preferred provider list.

All decisions made by the MDE are final. There is no appeal process.

Please note that being placed on the Preferred Provider List does not guarantee that a provider will be selected by an LEA to provide services.

Michigan Department of Education

2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

Preferred External Educational Services Provider Application

3

Two or more qualified reviewers will rate the application using the scoring rubric developed by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE).

Applications will only be **reviewed** if:

1. All portions of the application are complete;
2. All application materials, including attachments, are submitted electronically prior to the due date;

Applications will only be **approved** if:

1. The above conditions are met for review;
2. The total application score meets a minimum of 70 points

Exemplar	Total Points Possible
1. Description of comprehensive improvement services	25
2. Use of scientific educational research	15
3. Job embedded professional development	15
4. Experience with state and federal requirements	15
5. Sustainability Plan	15
6. Staff Qualifications	15
Total Points Possible	100
Minimum Points Required for Approval	70

Note: Applicants may apply to become preferred providers in all or some of the program delivery areas listed in Section B. If applicant does not wish to become a provider in a program area, that should be noted on the application.

If an applicant is applying to be a preferred provider in less than the five areas listed, they must have a review score not less than the following in each area for which they apply:

Section 1 15 points

Section 2 10 points

Section 3 10 points

Section 4 10 points

Section 5 10 points

Section 6 10 points Section 6 must be completed by all applicants.

Michigan Department of Education

2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

Preferred External Educational Services Provider Application

APPLICATION OVERVIEW

The Application is divided into four sections.

Section A contains basic provider information.

Section B requests information related to six exemplars (program delivery information and staff qualifications). Responses in Section B must be in narrative form. You may include figures (e.g., tables, charts, graphs) to support your narrative, but such items will be counted toward applicable page/word limits.

Section C contains the Assurances. Please read each statement carefully. By submitting your application, you certify your agreement with all statements therein.

Section D Attachments

SECTION A: BASIC PROVIDER INFORMATION

Please enter the requested information in the spaces provided. Be sure to read all notes, as they provide important information.

Instructions: Complete each section in full.

1. Federal EIN, Tax ID or Social Security Number

2. Legal Name of Entity

3. Name of Entity as you would like it to appear on the Approved List

4. Entity Type:

5. Check the category that best describes your entity:

☐ For-profit

☐ Business

☐ Institution of Higher Education

☐ Non-profit

☐ Community-Based Organization

☐ School District

☐ Educational Service Agency (e.g., RESA or ISD)

☐ Other (specify): _____

6. Applicant Contact Information

Name of Contact

Phone

Fax

Street Address

City

State

Zip

E-Mail

Website

Michigan Department of Education

2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

Preferred External Educational Services Provider Application

7

7. Local Contact Information (if different than information listed above)

Name of Contact

Phone

Fax

Street Address

City

State

Zip

E-Mail

Website

8. Service Area

List the intermediate school district and each individual district in which you agree to provide services. Enter "Statewide" ONLY if you agree to provide services to any district in the State of Michigan.

☐ Statewide

Intermediate School District(s):

Name(s) of District(s):

Michigan Department of Education

2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

Preferred External Educational Services Provider Application

8

9. Conflict of Interest Disclosure

Are you or any member of your organization currently employed in any capacity by any public school district or public school academy (charter school) in Michigan, or do you serve in a decision making capacity for any public school district or public school academy in Michigan (i.e. school board member)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

What school district are you employed by or serve: _____

In what capacity are you employed or do you serve (position title): _____

Schools or school districts are encouraged to apply to become preferred providers. However, the school or school district may not become a preferred provider in its own district. This restriction does not apply to Intermediate School Districts or Regional Educational Service Authorities.

IMPORTANT NOTE: Once approved, providers must operate within the information identified in this application.

Changes in application information may be requested in writing to MDE. The request must include the rationale for the changes. All changes must receive written approval from MDE prior to implementation and will be determined on a case-by-case basis. This includes, but is not limited to, information changes in the following categories:

- Change in service area
- Change in services to be offered
- Change in method of offering services

Michigan Department of Education

2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

Preferred External Educational Services Provider Application

SECTION B: PROGRAM DELIVERY AND STAFF QUALIFICATION NARRATIVES

Instructions: Section B responses must be in narrative form. Provide data/documentation of previous achievements where applicable. All responses must comply with stated page limits. Figures such as tables, charts and graphs can be included in the narrative, but such information will be counted toward page limits. Text and figures beyond the stated page limit will not be considered and should not be submitted with the application. All references must be cited.

Exemplar 1: Description of Comprehensive Improvement Services

(25 points possible)

Describe how comprehensive improvement services that result in dramatic, documented and sustainable improvement in underperforming urban secondary schools will be delivered to LEA's that contract for your services. Comprehensive services include, but are not limited to the following:

- Support systems to ensure student and teacher success and sustain improvement
- Content and delivery systems and mechanisms proven to result in dramatic and sustained improvement linked to student achievement
- Job embedded professional development at leadership, teacher and support levels to increase internal capacity for improvement and sustainability linked to student achievement
- Comprehensive short cycle and summative assessment systems to measure performance and goal attainment linked to the building school improvement plan.

Michigan Department of Education

2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

Preferred External Educational Services Provider Application

10

Exemplar 1 Narrative Limit: 4 pages (insert narrative here)

Michigan Department of Education

2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

Preferred External Educational Services Provider Application

Exemplar 2: Use of Scientific Educational Research

(15 points possible)

Describe how scientific educational research and evidence based practices will be used as the basis for all content and delivery systems and services provided to the LEA.

- The applicant should provide detailed data that supports successful performance in utilizing research and evidence-based practices in the delivery of systems and services, especially as applied to secondary school settings.
- Cite and reference available research studies (as appropriate) and **provide data** that indicate the practices used have a positive impact on the academic achievement of students in the subjects and grade levels in which you intend to provide services.

Exemplar 2 Narrative Limit: 3 pages (insert narrative here)

Exemplar 3: *Job Embedded Professional Development*
(15 points possible)

Describe how a job-embedded professional development plan will be put in place to support principals, school leadership teams, teachers, and support staff.

- The applicant should provide detailed data that supports successful performance in developing job-embedded professional development plans for:
 - principals
 - school leadership teams
 - teachers
 - support staff

Exemplar 3 Narrative Limit: 2 pages (insert narrative here).

Exemplar 4: *Experience with State and Federal Requirements*

(15 points possible)

Describe your experience with State and Federal Requirements, especially as it relates to the following:

- Aligning model(s) to be implemented with the School Improvement Framework
- The Michigan Comprehensive Needs Assessment
- Individual School/District Improvement Plans, North Central Association (NCA)
 - Response demonstrates alignment of the above mentioned elements, AKA "One Common Voice - One Plan."
- Understanding of Title 1 (differences between Targeted Assistance and School-wide)
- State assessments — Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) and the Michigan Merit Exam (MME)
- Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCEs)
- Michigan High School Content Expectations (HSCEs)
- Michigan Merit Curriculum
- Michigan Curriculum Framework
- Section 504 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Michigan Department of Education

2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

Preferred External Educational Services Provider Application

16

Exemplar 4 Narrative Limit: 2 pages (insert narrative here)

Michigan Department of Education

2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

Preferred External Educational Services Provider Application

Exemplar 5: Sustainability Plan

(15 points possible)

Describe how a sustainability plan will be put in place for the building to become self-sufficient at the end of the 3-year grant period.

- The applicant should demonstrate significant knowledge and experience in developing sustainability plans.

Exemplar 5 Narrative Limit: 2 pages (*insert narrative here*)

Exemplar 6: Staff Qualifications

(15 points possible)

Provide names and a brief summary of qualifications for the primary staff who will be involved in providing services to LEA's. Provide criteria for selection of additional staff that are projected to be working with LEA's. Include vitae of primary staff.

- Staff qualifications and vitae should match with areas that the applicant wishes to serve. Staff should have extensive experience in implementation of all applicable areas.

Exemplar 6 Narrative Limit: 1 page plus vitae for personnel (insert narrative and vitae here)

SECTION C: ASSURANCES

The applicant entity:

1. will follow all applicable legislation and guidance governing the Section 1003(g) school improvement grants.
2. will follow all applicable Federal, state, and local health, safety, employment, and civil rights laws at all times.
3. will comply with the MDE Standards for Monitoring Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants Preferred External Education Services Providers.
4. agrees to make all documents available to the MDE or LEA for inspection/monitoring purposes, and participate in site visits at the request of the MDE, the district, or facilitators/monitors for the SIG grant.
5. agrees to notify MDE and applicable district(s), in writing, of any change in the contact information provided in this application within ten business days.
6. ensures that it will provide written notification to MDE, when external preferred provider services will no longer be provided, thirty days prior to termination of services.
7. assures that they have accurately and completely described services they will provide to the LEA.
8. assures they will comply with SEA and LEA requirements and procedures.

Michigan Department of Education

2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

Preferred External Educational Services Provider Application

22

SECTION D: ATTACHMENTS

- **Licensure:** Applicants must attach a copy of their business license or formal documentation of legal status with respect to conducting business in Michigan (e.g., certificate of incorporation, proof of 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status). Schools, school districts, and ISDs/RESAs may substitute documents that include address/contact information and the appropriate building or district code as found in the Educational Entity Master (EEM).
- **Insurance:** Applicants must provide a proof of their liability insurance or a quote from an insurance agency that reflects the intent to obtain general and/or professional liability insurance coverage.

2010-2011

Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant

Preferred Service Provider

Application Rubric

Entity Name:

Reviewer:

Exemplar 1: Description of Comprehensive Improvement Services

The applicant must describe comprehensive improvement services that result in dramatic, documented and sustainable improvement in underperforming urban high schools that will be delivered to LEA's who contract for services. Comprehensive services include, but are not limited to the following:

- Support systems to ensure student and teacher success and sustain improvement
- Content and delivery systems and mechanisms proven to result in dramatic and sustained improvement linked to student achievement
- Job embedded professional development at leadership, teacher and support levels to increase internal capacity for improvement and sustainability linked to student achievement
- Comprehensive short cycle and summative assessment systems to measure performance and goal attainment linked to the building school improvement plan.

25 Points Possible

Not Recommended Response is marginally comprehensive and/or lacks clarity (0-10 points)	Recommended Response is comprehensive and clear (10-20 points)	Highly Recommended Exceptionally comprehensive, clear and thorough (21-25 points)	MAXIMUM 25 POINTS
Applicant does not provide evidence of past achievements in delivery of comprehensive improvement services that have had a dramatic impact on one or more underperforming urban (or other) high schools.	Applicant provides evidence of successful past performance in providing comprehensive services in one or more urban high schools. The evidence supports successful performance in at least 3 of the 4	Applicant provides detailed data that supports successful performance in providing comprehensive services that have resulted in dramatic and sustainable improvement in underperforming urban high schools. The data	

Response does not answer the question.	areas listed above.	supports successful performance in all areas listed above.	
--	---------------------	--	--

Comments are on the next page

Comments

Points this Section, Maximum of 25 _____

Exemplar 2: Use of Scientific Educational Research

The applicant must describe how scientific educational research and evidence based practices will be used as the basis for all content and delivery systems and services provided to the LEA. The response should provide detailed data that supports successful performance in utilizing research and evidence-based practices in the delivery of systems and services, especially as applied to secondary school settings.

Instructional Program – 15 Points Possible

Not Recommended Response is marginally comprehensive and/or lacks clarity (0-5 points)	Recommended Response is comprehensive and clear (6-12 points)	Highly Recommended Exceptionally comprehensive, clear and thorough (13-15 points)	MAXIMUM 15 POINTS
<p>Applicant does not provide a clear explanation or demonstrate knowledge of how research and evidence-based practices will be used as the foundation for the delivery of services provided to the LEA.</p> <p>Response does not answer the question.</p> <p>Applicant did not respond to the question. Does not wish to provide services in Area 2.</p>	<p>Applicant provides some evidence of successful past practice of using research and evidence based practices in the delivery of systems and services.</p>	<p>Applicant provides detailed data that supports successful performance in utilizing research and evidence-based practices in the delivery of systems and services, especially as applied to secondary school settings.</p>	

Comments

Points this Section, Maximum of 15: _____

Exemplar 3: Job Embedded Professional Development

The applicant must describe how a job-embedded professional development plan will be put in place to support:

- Building principals
- School leadership teams
- Teachers
- Building support staff

15 Points Possible

Not Recommended Response is marginally comprehensive and/or lacks clarity (0-5 points)	Recommended Response is comprehensive and clear (6-12 points)	Highly Recommended Exceptionally comprehensive, clear and thorough (13-15 points)	MAXIMUM 15 POINTS
<p>Applicant does not provide a clear explanation or demonstrate knowledge of how a job-embedded professional development plan will be put in place for the entire school team.</p> <p>Response does not answer the question.</p> <p>Applicant did not respond to the question.</p>	<p>Applicant provides some evidence of successful past practice of putting in place a job-embedded professional development plan for at least 2 of the groups named above.</p>	<p>Applicant provides detailed data that supports successful performance in developing job-embedded professional development plans for all 4 of the above listed groups.</p>	

Comments

Points this Section, Maximum of 15: _____

Exemplar 4: Experience with State and Federal Requirements

The applicant must describe experience with State and Federal Requirements, especially as it relates to the following:

- Aligning model(s) to be implemented with the School Improvement Framework
- The Michigan Comprehensive Needs Assessment
- Individual School/District Improvement Plans, North Central Association (NCA)
 - Demonstrate(s) alignment of the above mentioned elements, AKA "One Common Voice - One Plan."
- Understanding of Title 1 (differences between Targeted Assistance and School-wide)
- State assessments — Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) and the Michigan Merit Exam (MME)
- Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCEs)
- Michigan High School Content Expectations (HSCEs)
- Michigan Merit Curriculum
- Michigan Curriculum Framework
- Section 504 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

15 Points Possible

Not Recommended Response is marginally comprehensive and/or lacks clarity (0-5 points)	Recommended Response is comprehensive and clear (6-12 points)	Highly Recommended Exceptionally comprehensive, clear and thorough (13-15 points)	MAXIMUM 15 POINTS
Applicant does not have significant experience with stated and federal requirements as related to the needs of the	Applicant has some knowledge of and experience with state and federal requirements in at least 4 of the areas	Applicant has significant knowledge and experience in dealing with the state and federal requirements	

grant. Response does not answer the question. Applicant did not respond to the question. Does not wish to provide services in Area 4.	specified above.	required above.	
---	------------------	-----------------	--

Comments

Points this Section, Maximum of 15: _____

Exemplar 5: Sustainability Plan			
Applicant must describe how a sustainability plan will be put in place for a school building to become self-sufficient at the end of the 3-year grant period.			
15 Points Possible			
Not Recommended Response is marginally comprehensive and/or lacks clarity (0-5 points)	Recommended Response is comprehensive and clear (6-12 points)	Highly Recommended Exceptionally comprehensive, clear and thorough (13-15 points)	MAXIMUM 15 POINTS
Applicant does not have	Applicant has reasonable	Applicant has significant	

<p>significant experience in developing a sustainability plan.</p> <p>Response does not answer the question.</p> <p>Applicant did not respond to the question. Does not wish to provide services in Area 5.</p>	<p>knowledge and experience with the development of sustainability plans</p>	<p>knowledge and experience in developing sustainability plans.</p>	
---	--	---	--

Comments

Points this Section, Maximum of 15: _____

Exemplar 6: Staff Qualifications			
<p>The applicant must provide names and a brief summary of qualifications for the primary staff who will be involved in providing services to LEA's. Provide criteria for selection of additional staff that are projected to be working with LEA's. Attach vitae of primary staff in Section D.</p>			
15 Points Possible			
<p>Not Recommended</p> <p>Response is marginally comprehensive and/or</p>	<p>Recommended</p> <p>Response is comprehensive and clear</p>	<p>Highly Recommended</p> <p>Exceptionally comprehensive, clear</p>	<p>MAXIMUM 15 POINTS</p>

lacks clarity (0-5 points)	(6-12 points)	and thorough (13-15 points)	
Staff qualifications and vitae do not match with areas that applicant wishes to serve. Response does not answer the question.	Staff qualifications and vitae match with areas that the applicant wishes to serve. Staff has adequate but not extensive experience in all applicable areas (Exemplars 1-5).	Staff qualifications and vitae match with areas that the applicant wishes to serve. Staff has extensive experience in implementation of all five areas (Exemplars 1-5).	

Comments

Points this Section, Maximum of 15: _____

EXEMPLAR	POINTS AWARDED
7. Description of comprehensive improvement services	
8. Use of scientific educational research	
9. Job embedded professional development	
10. Experience with state and federal	

requirements

11. Sustainability Plan

12. Staff Qualifications

APPLICATION TOTAL

Recommended for Approval? (Total Score is 70 or Higher)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Y	N
	E	O
	S	

If an applicant is applying to be a preferred provider in less than the five areas listed, they must have a review score not less than the following in each area for which they apply:

- Section 1 15 points
- Section 2 10 points
- Section 3 10 points
- Section 4 10 points
- Section 5 10 points
- Section 6 10 points Section 6 must be completed by all applicants.

Attachment VII

School Improvement Partnership Agreement

This School Improvement Partnership Agreement ("SIPA") is entered into by and between _____ (State) _____ (ISD/RESA/ or other partner(s) and _____ ("LEA"). This agreement establishes a framework of collaboration, as well as articulates specific roles and responsibilities in the implementation of an approved plan of work to access Federal School Improvement Grant funds for Low Performing Schools under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA).

I. SCOPE OF WORK

The Scope of Work defines the actions and reform measures the Qualifying LEA agrees to implement under one of these four federally-defined options: Turnaround, Restart, Transformation or Closure. The model selected by _____ (LEA & Building Name)

Is _____;

II. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

A. QUALIFYING LEA RESPONSIBILITIES

In implementing the tasks and activities described in the ARRA Federal School Improvement Grant, the LEA will:

- 1) Choose to implement one of four options identified in this agreement and develop a corresponding plan.
- 2) Actively participate in all relevant meetings, communities of practice, or other practice-sharing events that are organized by the State of Michigan Department of Education (State) or its designee.

- 3) Post to any website specified by the Michigan Department of Education, in a timely manner, all non-proprietary products and lessons learned developed using funds associated with the ARRA Federal School Improvement Grant.
- 4) Participate, as requested, in any evaluations of this grant conducted by the Michigan Department of Education or United States Education Department (ED).
- 5) Be responsive to Michigan Department of Education (or its designee) or ED requests for information including status of the project, project implementation, outcomes, and any problems anticipated or encountered.
- 6) Participate in meetings and telephone conferences with the Michigan Department of Education or its designee to discuss (a) progress of the project, (b) potential dissemination of resulting non-proprietary products and lessons learned, (c) plans for subsequent years of the ARRA Federal School Improvement Grant, and (d) other matters related to the ARRA Federal School Improvement Grant and associated plans.
- 7) Each school shall establish a new leadership team composed (but not limited to) of the principal, classroom teachers who lead a grade level, a multiage team or subject-matter-area team, supplementary support personnel, and at least two community members who engage the community in the transformation. Each school-based team shall also have a liaison member representing the Michigan Department of Education or its designee.

B. INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL DISTRICT/REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICE AGENCY or OTHER DESIGNATED PARTNER RESPONSIBILITIES

To assist LEAs in implementing their tasks and activities described in the ARRA Federal School Improvement Grant, the partner or partners that elect to sign this memorandum of agreement to support the low performing school(s) shall:

- 1) Work collaboratively with, and support the LEA in carrying out the LEA Plan as identified in this agreement.

- 2) Provide feedback on the LEA's status updates, annual reports, any interim reports, and project plans and products.
- 3) Identify sources of technical assistance as needed.

C. JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES

- 1) The ISD/(R)ESA or other partner(s) and the LEA will each appoint a contact person for the ARRA Federal School Improvement Grant.
- 2) These key contacts from the ISD(R)ESA or other partner(s) and the LEA will maintain frequent communication to facilitate cooperation under this partnership agreement.

D. STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

To assist LEAs in implementing their tasks and activities described in the ARRA Federal School Improvement Grant, the State will:

- 1) Work collaboratively with, and support the LEA and supporting ISD/(R)ESA or consortium of ISDs/(R)ESAs or other partner(s) in carrying out the School Plan as noted in this agreement.
- 2) Timely distribute the LEA's portion of ARRA Federal School Improvement Grant funds during the course of the project period and in accordance with the School Plan as noted in this agreement.
- 3) Provide feedback on the LEA's status updates, annual reports, any interim reports, and project plans and products.
- 4) Identify sources of technical assistance as needed.
- 5) Periodically review the approved plan and implementation progress.

E. RECOURSE FOR NON-PERFORMANCE

If the Michigan Department of Education determines that the LEA or School is not meeting its goals, timelines, budget, or annual targets or is not fulfilling other applicable requirements, the Michigan Department of Education will make recommendations for an alternative intervention which may include restart, closure, or a collaborative process between the State, ISD/(R)ESA or other partner(s) and the LEA, including putting the LEA on reimbursement payment status, temporarily withholding funds, or disallowing costs, or modifying the approved plan.

III. ASSURANCES

The LEA hereby certifies and represents that:

- 1) It has all requisite power and authority to execute this partnership agreement.
- 2) It is familiar with the general scope of the ARRA Federal School Improvement Grant application and is supportive of and committed to working on all portions of the plan.
- 3) It will implement the Plan that has been approved by the Michigan Department of Education.
- 4) It will work cooperatively with the Michigan Department of Education or its designee to develop a Scope of Work with specific goals, activities, timelines, budgets, key personnel, and annual targets for key performance measures in a manner that is consistent with State and Federal School Improvement Goals.
- 5) It will comply with all of the terms of the ARRA Federal School Improvement Grant, and all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations.
- 6) Nothing in the School Improvement Partnership Agreement shall be construed to alter or otherwise affect the rights, remedies, and procedures afforded school district employees under Federal, State, or local laws (including applicable regulations or court orders or under the terms of collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding, or other agreements).

- 7) Any portion of the School Improvement Partnership Agreement that impacts upon a mandatory topic of bargaining not covered by an existing collective bargaining agreement, memorandum of understanding, or other agreement shall be implemented only after an agreement is reached through collective bargaining.

IV. MODIFICATIONS

This School Improvement Partnership Agreement may be amended only by written agreement signed by each of the parties involved, and in consultation with the State.

V. DURATION/TERMINATION

This School Improvement Partnership Agreement shall be effective, beginning with the date of the last signature hereon and, if a grant is received, ending upon the expiration of the grant project period, or upon mutual agreement of the parties, whichever occurs first.

VII. SIGNATURES

Local Superintendent (or equivalent authorized signatory) - required:

Signature/Date _____ Print Name/Title _____

President of Local School Board (or equivalent) - required:

Signature/Date _____ Print Name/Title _____

Intermediate Superintendent (or equivalent authorized signatory) - required:

Signature/Date _____ Print Name/Title _____

President of Intermediate School Board (or equivalent) - required:

Signature/Date _____ Print Name/Title _____

Authorized State Official - required:

By its signature below, the State hereby accepts the LEA as a Qualifying LEA.

Signature/Date _____ Print Name/Title _____

Attachment VIII

ATTACHMENT VIII-A: LEA COMMENT REQUEST



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

November 24, 2010

MEMORANDUM

TO: Local and Intermediate School District Superintendents and
Public School Academy Directors and Authorizers

FROM: Sally Vaughn, Ph.D.
Deputy Superintendent/Chief Academic Officer

SUBJECT: Waivers of Title I School Improvement Grant Requirements

The United States Department of Education (USED) has released the application for the second round of School Improvement Grants (SIGs)

under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The grants, through state educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs), are for use in Persistently Low Achieving (PLA) Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. These schools must demonstrate the greatest need for, and the strongest commitment to use of the funds in providing adequate resources that will substantially raise student achievement, and enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) and exit identification/improvement status.

Eligible schools are placed in a tier system. Tier I schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of the State's Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, or are Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years. Tier II schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of a state's secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds, or are secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years. Tier III schools are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as Tier I or Tier II schools. In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

The USED is allowing SEAs to apply for waivers of certain requirements in the SIGs. On or before December 3, 2010, The Michigan Department of Education will submit to the USED an application for the Section 1003(g) SIG that includes a request to

Page 2
November 24, 2010

waive the following requirements for all LEAs in Michigan that are awarded these funds:

- a) Paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary

schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made AYP for at least two consecutive years or are in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State's assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined. To summarize, a waiver of this requirement will allow more schools to be included in Tier II of this grant.

- b) Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the "all students" group in the grades assessed is less than 30. To summarize, a waiver of this requirement will allow the State to exclude "small schools" that test a low number of students (less than 30) from the persistently low achieving lists.
- c) Section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2011–2012 school year to "start over" in the school improvement timeline. To summarize, a school that chooses either of these reform models will no longer be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under the ESEA.
- d) The 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in Section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four school intervention models. To summarize, schools receiving this grant will not have to meet the Federal guidelines that establish a minimum number of low income students enrolled before the school can choose "schoolwide" Title I status.
- e) Section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2014. To summarize, schools will have a longer period than normally allowed to utilize these funds.

Page 3
November 24, 2010

Please visit <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf> for more information on the School Improvement Grant and explanation of the "tier" system referenced above.

LEAs wishing to comment on the School Improvement Grant waiver request should submit comments to ARRAWaiverResponse@michigan.gov by November 30, 2010. Please include the phrase "SIG waiver comments" in the subject line. Comments should be specific to waiver requests a) through e) outlined above.

Questions may be directed to Bill Witt at 517-335-4733 or by email at ARRAWaiverResponse@michigan.gov.

cc: Michigan Education Alliance

ATTACHMENT VIII-B: LEA COMMENTS

Tier II –Transformation

- a) Providing funding for the 'persistently low achieving (PLA) schools is the intent of the regulation Section 1003(g). Agree fund all schools as originally intended with approved reform plans;
- b) Agree with this section, these schools should not be part of this process; the regulations allow the exclusion of these schools.
- c) Agree with this section: Reform means to start over....The PLA schools should no longer be in school improvement phases as they proceed through an approved reform process; would also eliminate the NCLB set-sides? District would be able to direct those funds to the reform initiatives.
- d) This section, I question the relevance of this section of the waiver; Title I School wide status is clearly for schools with high poverty.
- e) Agree with this section of the waiver, district need extended time to utilize funds, similar to the ARRA funds timelines or within the 3 year funding cycle.

Val Hughes

Westwood Community School District

ATTACHMENT VIII-C: PUBLIC COMMENT REQUEST

Public Comment Request

Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant Waivers

The United States Department of Education (USED) has released the application for the second round of School Improvement Grants (SIG) under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The grants, through state educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) are for use in Persistently Low Achieving (PLA) Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. These schools must demonstrate the greatest need for, and the strongest commitment to the use of the funds in providing adequate resources that will substantially raise student achievement, and enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) and exit identification/improvement status.

Eligible schools are placed in a tier system. Tier I schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of the State's Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, or are Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years. Tier II schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of a state's secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds, or are secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years. Tier III schools are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as Tier I or Tier II schools. In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

The USED is allowing SEAs to apply for waivers of certain requirements in the School Improvement Grants (SIGs). On or before December 3, 2010, The Michigan Department of Education will submit to the USED

an application for the Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants that includes a request to waive the following requirements for all LEAs in Michigan that are awarded these funds:

- a) Paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made AYP for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined. To summarize, a waiver of this requirement will allow more schools to be included in Tier II of this grant.
- b) Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than 30. To summarize, a waiver of this requirement will allow the State to exclude “small schools” that test a low number of students (less than 30) from the persistently low achieving lists.
- c) Section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2011–2012 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline. To summarize, a school that chooses either of these reform models will no longer be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under the ESEA.
- d) The 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four school intervention models. To summarize, schools receiving this grant will not have to meet the Federal guidelines that establish a minimum number of low income students enrolled before the school can choose “schoolwide” Title I status.
- e) Section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September

30, 2014. To summarize, schools will have a longer period than normally allowed to utilize these funds.

Please visit <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf> for more information on the School Improvement Grant and explanation of the "tier" system referenced above.

Individuals wishing to comment on the SIG waiver request should submit comments to ARRAWaiverResponse@michigan.gov by November 30, 2010. Please include the phrase "SIG waiver comments" in the subject line. Comments should be specific to waiver requests a) through e) outlined above.

Questions may be directed to Bill Witt at 517-335-4733 or by email at ARRAWaiverResponse@michigan.gov.

ATTACHMENT VIII-D: PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comments were received in response to this waiver request.